

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s., with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 25s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage.

Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 4s. 6d.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 16, 1867.

THE RECENT DECISION of Vice-Chancellor Malins, which will be found in this week's number of the *Weekly Reporter*, respecting the position of the shareholders in Overend, Gurney, & Co. (Limited) is commented upon, from a legal point of view, in another portion of our columns. Viewing the question as the public will view it, with regard to its effect on what may be called the "joint-stock principle," its importance is obvious. Mr. John Stuart Mill, in weighing the advantages and disadvantages of joint-stock enterprise, and after remarking that it renders possible the successful conduct of undertakings beyond the reach of private capital, added these words (we are quoting from his "Political Economy") :—"There are other cases, again, in which, though the business might be perfectly well transacted with small or moderate capitals, the guaranty of a great subscribed stock is necessary or desirable as a security to the public for the fulfilment of pecuniary engagements, this is especially the case where the nature of the business requires that numbers of persons should be willing to trust the concern with their money, as in the business of banking, and that of insurance, to both of which the joint-stock principle is eminently adapted." It requires no prophetic vision to see that if the "security" alluded to by Mr. Mill is liable to be withdrawn in consequence of the shareholders obtaining rescission of their share contracts *en masse*, a heavy blow is struck at the feasibility of joint-stock enterprise. We have, however, pointed out this consequence before. Still, it is the province of the Court of Equity, of all courts, not to legislate, but to carry into effect the provisions of existing legislation; and consequently, such considerations as that to which we have just adverted can form no part of the considerations which the Court has to weigh in the present case.

Such a lamentable case as that of Overend, Gurney, & Co. (Limited) may never (we will hope so) occur again. The shareholders and creditors have each been duped; each are equally innocent; it will be the function of the Court of last resort finally to determine by which the burden is to be borne.

IT IS WITH THE LIVELIEST GRATIFICATION, though not without some surprise, that we learn that Lord Justice Cairns has, at the earnest solicitation of the Government, decided upon accepting the coronet which he already once, if not oftener, declined.

Last Thursday the leading journal devoted a paragraph of about half a column's length in its largest type, headed throughout, to the statement that Lord Justice General McNeill and Sir Hugh Cairns would be raised forthwith to the peerage to reinforce the scant judicial strength of the Upper House. As it was not suggested, however, that the new Lord Justice of Appeal intends to resign his high office, it is not very clear in what manner his elevation will add to the number of working law lords. Surely the same reasons which have proved so effectual to prevent Lord Romilly from ever appearing in the "red chamber" before 5 o'clock p.m., will be at least equally efficient in the case of

the Lord Justice; and, moreover, we know of no change in the learned judge's position which would make a peerage now more acceptable to him than it was a few months ago, when he most unequivocally declined the honour. However this may be, and whether the reasons given by the *Times* are the real *causa causans* of his promotion or not, the fact is certain, that the Lord Justice is immediately to be raised to the peerage under the title of Baron Cairns.

Whether there are or not equally good grounds for the report in the case of the Lord-Justice-General, it is hard to say, at any rate we shall only be too happy to hear that so good a precedent has at length been set of throwing open the very highest professional reward to the ambition of the bar of Scotland, hitherto too much excluded therefrom. We most heartily concur with the *Times* in the opinion that it is but reasonable that a Scotch lawyer should have a seat in the House, and we have no doubt that, of all Scotch lawyers, the Right Hon. Duncan McNeill is about the most eminently fitted for such an honour. The Lord-Justice-General was born in 1794, and is consequently seventy-three years of age. Sir Hugh Cairns is barely forty-seven, and is, we believe, the youngest lawyer who ever fought his own way into the Upper House of Parliament.

IN THE COURSE OF THE ARGUMENTS in the case of *Fox v. Gurnell* before the Lords Justices on Thursday, an observation was made by one of the counsel upon a point of costs, with reference to the plaintiff having insisted upon having the hearing of some incidental question adjourned from chambers into court. Thereupon Lord Justice Turner said that he was not at all disposed to discourage applications by suitors to have their causes heard by the judge himself. He had observed, he said, with regret, that many matters are now decided by the chief clerks which ought to be heard by the judge personally, the suitor having an unqualified right to have his cause so heard. This opinion, coming from so high a quarter, ought to attract attention, not only because the present tendency of chamber practice is to increase the number and importance of the matters heard by the chief clerks, but also because it is bad in principle that suitors who are entitled to the personal services, if we may use the term, of the judge, should be deprived of this advantage, which ought to be given them in every case not absolutely formal. It is very instructive to look at the 29th section of the Act 15 & 16 Vict. c. 80, and at Rule 1 of the Cons. Ord., xxxv. and then to review the vast amount of business transacted by the chief clerks which does not come within the spirit of that rule. It is not to the point to say in reply that the chief clerks are perfectly competent to decide such questions as may come before them. This may be admitted with some slight qualification; but we are sure that great dissatisfaction prevails at the course things have taken as regards chamber practice, and that many suitors are deterred from going to the judge on questions which, although he might not decide them in a different way, yet deserve his personal attention; because the risk of being saddled with costs makes it evident to the solicitor that *le jeu ne vaut pas la chandelle*. Such cases as these ought to be taken before the judge in the first instance, for even cheap law does not make up for an unsatisfactory decision.

THE CONSTANTLY INCREASING—and, in our opinion, most pernicious—tendency both of juries and home secretaries to treat as irresponsible lunatics all persons guilty of aggravated crimes, if not solely on account of such crimes themselves, at any rate whenever the accused is subject to any peculiarities or eccentricities of character, however little such eccentricities may have to do with the particular crime of which he has been guilty, render it necessary, in our opinion, that some steps should be taken

—and that promptly—to check a practice of so dangerous example.

The fatal facility with which certain eminent physicians see a lunatic (and therefore an irresponsible being) in every victim of some harmless delusion or monomania, and the absurd readiness of the public to accept the dogma as to "irresistible impulses," which, if pushed to its fair conclusions, would negative all responsibility for crime, render it doubly important that all those who feel that "society is greater than the individual," and that consciousness of wrong, not perfect balance of character, is the true test of responsibility, should come forward to prevent the total subversion of these principles by the operation of the vicious tendency we have mentioned.

Under these circumstances we are especially glad to be able to call attention to a paper on this subject published in the *Medical Journal*, which we give in another column. It will be found to contain a masterly exposition of the true principles on which we should act in the treatment of criminals alleged to be lunatic, in conformity with the celebrated decision in *McNaghten's case*, now too little known or acted upon.

We hope that public attention will somehow be attracted to this subject, and that we may thus be saved from the morbid susceptibilities of monomaniac doctors and sympathising juries.

THE COMMITTEE OF LAYMEN on Ritualism have issued a report on the subject to which they have requested us to give publicity. An abstract of this report will be found in another column. We believe it has been arranged that a deputation should wait upon the Prime Minister on the subject of a royal commission, as recommended in the report.

HEDGES EYRE CHATTERTON, Esq., Solicitor-General, was elected on Monday without opposition, for the University of Dublin; he was proposed by the Rev. Joseph Carson, D.D., F.T.C., and seconded by the Hon. and Rev. W. C. Plunket. The Right Hon. Michael Morris, Attorney-General, was on the same day re-elected for the borough of Galway without opposition.

WE REGRET to have to announce the death of Charles James Knowles, Esq., Q.C. He was a bencher of the Middle Temple. Mr. Knowles was called to the bar in Michaelmas Term, 1823, and received a silk gown in 1841. He for several years filled the office of Attorney-General for the County Palatine of Lancaster, which he resigned in order to make way for Edward James, Esq., Q.C., M.P. for Manchester, the present Attorney-General.

WE REGRET to have to announce the death of Mr. William Harding, solicitor, coroner for North Staffordshire, which took place on Saturday, at his residence at Cobridge. Mr. Harding was the oldest coroner in England when he died, and during his long tenure of office he held upwards of 7,000 inquests.

SIR JOHN BURGESS KARS LAKE, the Solicitor-General, was returned for Andover on Monday last without opposition.

THE NEW LAW COURTS.

The competition for the new law courts attracts much of the attention of the general public, but to the class of readers whom we address it is a matter of really personal interest. The facility with which their own business is to be transacted day by day, in future years, is, in a great degree, dependent on the construction and arrangement of this multitude of courts and offices.

We propose to say nothing about the merits of the several designs in form of architectural effect. This is amply discussed in many contemporary journals. But their internal arrangement is a matter upon which our readers ought to have an opinion, while the necessary complexity of a building which is to contain many more

than a thousand rooms devoted to a great variety of purposes, renders it extremely difficult to form one. Without any further apology, therefore, we beg our readers to accompany us in an investigation how far the public convenience has been consulted by the competing architects in their internal arrangements. If the inquiry be difficult or unattractive, this consideration is outweighed by its importance.

The architects, whose designs are now exhibited in New-square, Lincoln's Inn, are Messrs. Waterhouse, Street, Seddon, Scott, Lockwood, Garling, Deane, Burges, Brandon, Barry, and Abraham.

We propose to take them in order and consider how each of them has met the difficult requirements of the case. But first we must state briefly what those requirements are. The area covered by the building is about 700 feet by 500. It is of necessity penetrated throughout by paths and passages, corridors and bridges, inviting and perplexing the bewildered stranger at ever step. It will be used every day by persons who, although they have business to do, have never or have rarely visited it before. The first essential condition of success, therefore, is simplicity of arrangement. The main divisions should be such that the visitor may readily understand them. Thus, the parts appropriated to the several courts should be absolutely distinct, and the same marked division of departments should be carried out in detail. The court, the judge's private rooms, his secretary's rooms, the jury rooms, witness's rooms, consultation rooms, and also the judge's chambers, being all provided for the work of one court, and named by its name, should be like the stray bits of Cromarty, which besprinkle various Scotch counties massed together. Since, however, the judge's chambers are provided, not to aid work done in court, but to do work not done there by them, they should be separate from the court and its appurtenant rooms. Further, the various sub-divisions should be on the same plan, so that when the geography of one is learned, that of all will be known.

Secondly, there are many different classes of persons to be provided for, whom it is important to keep separate from one another. Thus the judges should have private entrances and corridors leading them to their own rooms and courts. The Bar should be allowed similar accommodation, and they should be able to enter the building from their chambers without crossing crowded thoroughfares. The passages appropriated to the use of the bar may be shared by them with solicitors and parties to suits, as such persons would often come together from the barrister's chambers to Court, but it would be highly inconvenient that jurymen and witnesses in attendance, court officials, and reporters, should have no other means of access to the courts. It is also most important that mere spectators should not be allowed to interfere with, or stand in the way (literally) of, persons who have business to do.

The publicity of our Courts, however, should be a fact and not a pretence. It should not be made so inconvenient for a spectator to enter the Courts that he will never do it. Every possible facility should be given to him which does not interfere with the transaction of business. In our present courts the number of spectators is often a serious obstruction, and the noise they make in moving about is most inconvenient. The inference is, not that they should be excluded from the Court, but that they should be placed in galleries where they will be out of the way, and where their noise will be less heard by judges and counsel, and to prevent the noise of walking in the gallery there should be doors enough to make the distance between any seat and the exit short.

A large central hall is very convenient for a meeting, but its use for this purpose would be destroyed if spectators were allowed to crowd into it, therefore they should not be admitted into the central hall, and there should be no direct means of access from it to the galleries in the courts.

It has been strongly urged that the passages should be so arranged as to give no convenient thoroughfare from Carey-street to the Strand. On the other hand, it has been argued that there is a class of persons who, however labyrinthine the passages may be made, will find a way and constantly use it when once they are familiar with the building. Without presuming to decide this speculative question, we avow our opinion that such a thoroughfare, if merely a footway, is a positive advantage. If it were not it would not be used; and it ought to be provided if that can be done without interfering with the convenience of others.

Thirdly, stairs so greatly increase the time and trouble of passing from place to place, that they should be as few and as little to be trodden as possible. If barristers are to use a bridge over Carey-street, they should not have to descend from that level, neither should they have to ascend higher. This consideration determines the height of the court floor, and all the courts should, if possible, be on the same level. This floor should also, if possible, contain the private rooms and chambers of the judges, the robing rooms, refreshment rooms, library, reading room, and consultation rooms for the bar. If it cannot, they should be as little removed from it as possible. For the same reason there should be few storeys above the court level; and in passing from one room to another on the same floor, this should be done on the level; it should not be necessary to go up stairs and down again. The inconvenience of many stairs should fall only on the persons entitled to least consideration. If it is pardonable to impose it on the mere spectator, it is undesirable to inflict it upon a jurymen or witness, objectionable on a barrister or solicitor, unjustifiable on a judge.

Last in our list of requirements, but not least in importance, are light, air, and quiet. For light and ventilation large internal areas are necessary. In order to secure quiet, no important rooms should look upon streets where there is much traffic, and the tread of footsteps along corridors, and especially the noise of the central hall, should be carefully excluded from the courts.

We have placed the names of the competing architects in an alphabetical series; but we have found it convenient in discussing their designs to reverse the usual order. Before, however, we proceed to the detailed explanation of any of the plans, let the reader understand one feature common to all the designs. The building consists of a hollow square several storeys high. Inside this, and separated by areas, is a lower building, at the top of which (with a few exceptions) are placed the courts. The object of this arrangement is to secure for the courts themselves the greatest amount of light and of quiet; and each architect makes his own application of this general idea.

In Mr. Waterhouse's plan, the central block is divided from the outer buildings on its north and south sides by two internal streets, called Equity Street and Common Law Street, each 53 feet wide (about the width, we believe, of Chancery-lane, at the Union Bank). A large hall, 60 feet in width, runs from end to end of the same pile of buildings. The floor of this hall is slightly higher than the level of Carey-street. If the reader supposes himself to be standing in it, facing Westward, he will leave all the Courts of Equity, including a spare court, and the Probate, Ecclesiastical, and Admiralty Courts on his right hand, and the Courts of Common Law on his left. Straight in front of him is the Court of Exchequer Chamber; while still further to the left than the Common Law Courts, and facing the Strand, but protected from its noise by a loggia, is the Court of Bankruptcy.

All these are on the same floor, one story above the central hall, from which each of them is approached by a separate staircase. There are, however, two courts, not on the same level; one a spare Court of Common Law, immediately above the Exchequer Chamber, not positively required by the instructions. The other, which is immediately beneath the Exchequer Chamber, for the use of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, who

desired that their court might be placed on the level of the Strand.

Such is the general plan. As the arrangement of all the courts and their offices is uniform, the explanation of one in detail will put the reader in possession of the whole. Let us take as our type the Queen's Bench Banco Court. Behind the Bench, and on the same level, that is to say, four feet above the level of the court, are the judge's robing and retiring rooms. Behind the other end are the two consultation rooms and a room for barristers' clerks. At the side of the court is a room for witnesses immediately wanted, a provision peculiar to the plan we are now describing, which will prevent delay in their appearance. These rooms are on the court floor. The floor below contains rooms for the judges' clerks, for attorneys, and for the plaintiff's witnesses, while the defendant's witnesses have rooms provided for them on the floor above. On the other side of Common Law-street, precisely opposite to the court, and on a level with the bench, are the judges' chambers, connected with the court by a bridge of which the judge has the exclusive use.

Complete privacy is secured to the judges. Corridors for their sole use conduct them to all their courts and chambers, and to their common room. Another corridor is appropriated to barristers and solicitors. All other persons who have business to do can make their way to the courts by the staircase leading from the central hall.

Mere spectators are admitted only into the galleries, of which there are three in each court, a somewhat excessive provision, the reader will probably think, for courts of equity, except on very rare occasions. To these galleries they ascend by staircases from the ground floor, without entering the central hall, for this they are not permitted to do; and if they were, they could not reach the galleries directly from it.

In the matter of stairs, Mr. Waterhouse has made arrangements peculiarly favourable to the judges. He has actually provided for them a drive to the very level, not of the court, but of the bench. Thus, once set down from their carriages, they can proceed to their private rooms, the benches of their several courts, and their chambers, without any ascent or descent. Mr. Waterhouse is evidently of opinion that judges, being men who have arduously climbed to the top of the ladder of forensic ambition, should never be required to go one step higher.

The Bar are not quite so well off. They will generally enter the building by the bridges from Lincoln's Inn and the Temple, and this requires an ascent. These bridges are in a line with one another on the same level with the courts. They are connected by a corridor from which run westward four parallel corridors leading to the various courts and judges' chambers. Their common room, robing rooms, and refreshment rooms are on the same floor. Thus, once on the court level, they would never have to use stairs, were it not that their library is on the floor above.

Enjoying these arrangements, they may well excite the envy of the spectator. The staircase by which he ascends to his gallery leads only to two courts, so that, if, finding the business of one court dull, he wishes to go to any other, except the one immediately adjoining, he will have to go down two flights of stairs in order to reach the spectators' corridor, and thence to ascend again.

Quiet is secured by the simple expedient of allowing no room in which quiet is needed, except the Bankruptcy Court and some of its attendant offices, to face the Strand, while the courts and the rooms in which perfect freedom from noise is most essential, are lighted from above, or from the internal streets, or the central hall.

The internal streets cannot be entered except from the Strand. They contain only the private entrances of the higher officials, and, therefore, will be little used during the hours of business, and the noise of the corridors is excluded from the courts by making them open only into lobbies from which the courts are entered.

The merits of the scheme of ventilation are too technical

to be discussed here; it is elaborate, and, if it were out of order, there is, perhaps, barely sufficient natural ventilation to take its place; but it has answered well elsewhere. The wide internal streets, moreover, and the central hall, the roof of which admits fresh air, under its eaves are some guaranty for an adequate supply of that important want, which is further secured thus: immediately beneath the courts there are no rooms, but merely a vacant space, which serves as a reservoir, from which cool or properly warmed air may continually rise.

This arrangement has another effect, that all the rooms below the courts look directly into one of the internal streets or the central hall. As the roof of this hall is composed of alternate spaces of glass and ornamental wood-work (the latter far the narrower), the rooms which look into it will be well lighted. The darkest corridor is that provided for the public; but it is lighted by staircase windows at intervals of twenty or thirty feet. The courts are lighted by windows behind the judges and by skylights. The ceiling of the court has a large sheet of glass in it, and above this is a high pitched glass roof. Thus the quantity of light will be ample. On the other hand, it is said that light from above is less pleasant to the eye than that which comes through high windows, and there would be some greater liability to noise from hail.

We have given this detailed description of one design in order to give the reader some idea how a building might actually be arranged so as to comply with instructions of such very great complicity and difficulty. To repeat the process ten times would be tedious to the reader. We propose, therefore, simply to draw attention to what seems most worthy of remark in the other plans.

Mr. Street's plan, in its general arrangement, aims rather at the convenience of persons who know the geography of the building well, than at simplicity of scheme. The disposition of the courts is complicated; but they are all, without exception, on the same floor. In the centre of them all, at a level a few steps lower, is placed the accommodation for the bar, their library, refreshment rooms, common room, and robing rooms. The judges' chambers, instead of being placed in every case near to the courts to which they belong, are collected together in large masses; and they are not all upon the court floor. The central hall is on the floor above the courts, on a level with the spectators' galleries; but the spectator, the only person whose entrance to the court is on that level, is prevented by iron grilles from entering it. This hall, therefore, would probably be little used.

The judge has to mount by stairs or a lift to his private room; but there he is on the level of his bench, and, in the case of some of the judges, on the level of his chambers also. The barrister has to ascend a few steps from the bar rooms to the courts; but he can proceed from court to court without encountering any stairs. The spectator, when he has ascended to the height of his gallery, has the range of half the courts without any descent, unless it is thought better to restrict his freedom by barriers, not at present intended by the architect.

Mr. Street's courts are lighted, like Mr. Waterhouse's, by sky-lights, assisted by side windows, which open into internal areas of from fourteen to twenty feet in width. Most of the important rooms look into much larger areas. But the corridors are narrow, and some of them dark.

Mr. Street, in addition to the more obvious expedients for securing quiet, excluding carriage traffic from all his internal areas except two, arranges the neighbouring thoroughfares so as to divert it as much as possible from Carey-street, and place steps in Bell-yard, so as to render it impassable for carriages.

(To be continued.)

THERE have been 1,600 divorces granted in Massachusetts in the last six years.

THE DECISION IN "RE OVEREND, GURNEY, & Co." (OAKES' MOTION.—PEAKE'S MOTION, 15 W. R. 397.)

As might have been predicted, the little court in which Vice-Chancellor Malins has to exercise his judicial functions was crammed to excess on Saturday last (Feb. 9) with persons anxious to hear the Vice-Chancellor decide on which of two equally innocent classes of persons the burden of a ruinous loss must fall. As our consideration of the decision will occupy a considerable amount of space, we shall proceed at once to the dry legal principles involved, leaving the rest to our non-professional contemporaries. During the lengthy period which elapsed between the commencement of the argument in this case and the delivery of the Vice-Chancellor's judgment, we of course abstained from offering any comments upon the matter. We regret, however, to see that a gentleman styling himself "A Barrister," of Lincoln's-inn, thought fit, during the progress of the argument, to publish a pamphlet attempting to show that there had been no misrepresentation practised in the matter. We think that, at such a time, this publication was in very bad taste. The committee of the Defence Association, with a better feeling, delayed the publication of their "report" until after the delivery of the judgment.

The Vice-Chancellor commenced his judgment with a short digest of the circumstances leading up to the case—the position of the old firm at and during the few years immediately preceding the date of the transfer, and the circumstances attending the transfer and the issue of the prospectus. As he shortly put it, the firm was, at the date of the transfer, insolvent to the extent £2,000,000, if not £3,000,000; and against this vast liability, as handed over to the new company, was marshalled the mere guaranty of the old partners. Taking into consideration the fact that £1,000,000 of the property by which this guaranty was backed up consisted of capital locked up in the Norwich Bank, and of the goodwill of that business—assets which could not be available in every emergency—the Vice-Chancellor was of opinion that the assets of the old partners were insufficient for the purposes of the guaranty. But, had this been otherwise, the public who were invited to join the new company, had a right to be informed that in so doing they were rendering themselves responsible for an enormous mass of liabilities, against which their security was to be the guaranty aforesaid. The directors perhaps believed—probably did so—that additional capital and good management would carry the concern out of danger, and that so the guaranty would never be actually required and a grand business would be saved from extinction. But those who were invited to join them in this scheme had a full right to know the entire nature of the venture so temptingly held out to them; and, had this information been frankly supplied, it could not be supposed that the share-subscription would ever have been taken up. That under these circumstances the statements contained in the prospectus amounted to "fraud" the Vice-Chancellor entertained no doubt—and there can be no doubt "Fraud," to vitiate a contract; may consist in *suppression veri* or *suggestio falsi*. Here the unwelcome truth was simply suppressed wholesale; and to deny this, after the disclosures which have been made, is mere idle assertion. The conduct of the directors of Overend, Gurney, & Co. (Limited) the Vice-Chancellor pronounced to be wholly inexcusable, and probably few have read his words without echoing his opinion.

Gross misrepresentation being proved to have been perpetrated in the promulgation of the new company's prospectus, it followed, of course, that, as between themselves and the directors, or themselves and the company, the duped shareholders would be entitled to be released from liability. Then came the doubtful question, which we have often discussed in these columns—How, as against the creditors? To a legal listener it was evident, from the moment Sir Richard Malins turned to the law of the matter, that he was about to decide in

favour of the creditors' equity. He adverted to the state of law which existed before the Joint-Stock Companies Act, 1856, and, with respect to the creditors' right against shareholders in a similar case at that time, cited *Henderson v. The Royal British Bank*, 5 W. R. 286, 11 E. & B. 356. Then, What had been effected by the Acts of 1856 and 1862? He thought the change was merely one of machinery, and that the creditors' rights were not intended to be injuriously affected. The consideration then proceeded downwards until it reached *Ship's case*, which his Honour cited from 13 W. R. 599, and here he made a pause. For his own opinion he dissented strongly from the decision in *Ship's case*, but would nevertheless have felt bound by it, had it, in his opinion, been applicable to the case before him. He thought—and here was the main substance of the decision—that it was not applicable to the case of Overend, Gurney, & Co.; in *Ship's case* the contract was void, here it was merely voidable. This distinction left the Vice-Chancellor free to deal with the case before him according to his own view of the creditor and shareholder question, and consequently to hold that although as against the directors (*i.e.*, the company) alone, the shareholders' claim to be struck off must have been well-founded, yet that the creditors had a right to have them retained upon the register. Mr. Peake being merely a transferee, and not an original allottee of shares, his claim was additionally negatived by *Duranty's case*, 7 W. R. 70. Both applications were consequently refused with costs.

We have thus indicated the chief ingredients of the Vice-Chancellor's decision, we shall now offer a few remarks upon the manner in which his Honour has treated the difficult subject with which he has had to deal.

Upon the preliminary question, whether or no the suppression of the real position of the undertaking amounted to "fraud" capable of invalidating a contract, the exposition of the Vice-Chancellor is clear and masterly, and the profession are indebted to him for a concise reiteration of the principles laid down in *Ravlin v. Wickham*, 7 W. R. 145, 1 De G. & J. 304, and similar cases. There could indeed be little doubt upon the point, but the public are likely to fare none the worse for having Sir Richard Malins' enunciation of it before them.

With regard to the position of the creditors of joint-stock companies, before the Companies' Act of 1862 came into operation, we must refer our readers to our former* remarks. Prior to that Act the creditor's position seems to have been simply this—that, as between him and the shareholder whose contract with the company was tainted by fraud, the case was one of "first come, first served." If the creditor opened the bill by suing out a *sci. fa.* against the shareholder, the latter was not permitted to set up his fraud against the creditor's claim. If, on the other hand, the shareholder was the first to take the field—say, by filing a bill praying rescission of his contract with the company, it seems that the creditor would not be allowed to step in and say that he had a right to have the shareholder retained in *statu quo* until he could train a *sci. fa.* to bear on him. And we think that *Henderson v. The Royal British Bank* (*ubi sup.*) is applicable merely to the first of the above alternatives.

Then comes the question, How has the position of the creditor been affected by the Joint-Stock Companies Act 1856 and the Company's Act 1862; or, as the latter only concerns us in the present case, by the Act of 1862? The Vice-Chancellor thought the change made thereby was merely one of machinery, and could not believe that the alteration was intended to prejudice the previous rights of creditors. With the utmost deference to his Honour, we must remark that reasoning founded upon the intention of a statutory enactment is only applicable where the enacting words are of doubtful import. The effect of the Companies Act 1862 upon the position of creditors admits,

we think, of no doubt whatever—they are no longer able to single out individual shareholders, but can only act against the company through the medium of a liquidator, either an official appointed by the Court of Chancery under a winding-up order, or chosen by the Company themselves in case of a voluntary winding-up.

The Vice-Chancellor next proceeds to inquire whether any decision exists, posterior in date to the Act of 1856 or 1862, relative to the rights of creditors against shareholders induced to become so by corporate fraud. *Ship's case* (*ubi sup.*) had been relied upon by the counsel who supported the two motions now before him. In our last volume* we pointed out the distinction between misrepresentation and variation from the scheme of the undertaking as set forth in the prospectus. The Vice-Chancellor takes a further distinction, and says—in *Ship's case*, and cases of that class, the person whose name was on the register had agreed to become a member of a different company, and never was a member of the company in question; the contract was therefore void simply, and not merely voidable as in the case where a contract is induced by fraud. With deference, again, we must observe that this distinction appears to us untenable. In *Ship's case*, for instance, Mr. Ship had contracted to become a member of a certain corporation, whose corporate name was "The Scottish Universal Finance Bank," and which might also be identified in other ways. On the register of this company his name was placed, and had he chosen to retain his shares (as he probably would have done if the concern had prospered) † the directors could not have gainsaid him. He might also, as Mr. Briggs did in *Briggs' case*, 1 L. R. Eq. 483, and as others have done, have bound himself by acquiescence; and how can that contract be called void *ab initio* which is capable of subsequent confirmation? We cannot but think that, as far as regards the equity of creditors, the distinction thus drawn between *Ship's case* and a case of misrepresentation is insubstantial and illusory. The matter may, we think, be viewed thus—In *Ship's case* a certain name was on the register, whose owner had an equity to have it removed. The creditors said that they had a right to be paid before that equity could be raised: but the Lords Justices, affirming Vice-Chancellor Wood, held that the creditors had no such right as against the person seeking to escape, because "they had trusted the company collectively, and not individual members," a *ratio decidendi* which equally applies to a case of misrepresentation. *Ship's case* appears, therefore, in the light of a general authority for the principle that an equity to be struck off the register may be raised in the face of creditors.

In our opinion, if the creditors' equity can prevail (without expressly overruling *Ship's case*, it must be on the following short ground. We have shown how, according to our view of the old law, the creditor's position depended upon his being the first to take proceedings. Has then the Act now in force, by depriving the creditor of the ability to confront himself with any single shareholder, incapacitated him from successfully resisting a shareholder's attempt to escape? We decline to form, much more to express, an opinion; but it may be that it has not. The Legislature certainly could not have intended such an alteration. What has it done? It has transferred the power hitherto exercisable by the individual creditor to an officer called a liquidator (a name grievous to the ears of shareholders), by and through whom alone the creditors may now act. And it seems to us very fairly arguable that the moment the creditors become represented by an official liquidator they are, as against a shareholder who subsequently seeks to escape, in the position of the creditor under the old system, who sued out his *sci. fa.* before the shareholder commenced any proceeding on his own part. The result of this

* 10 Sol. Jour. 1132.

† We do not, however, insist on any argument founded on this consideration, because the doctrine of mutuality is not inexorably applicable to contracts to take shares, any more than to other contracts.—L. B. C.

* 10 Sol. Jour. 1132.

principle, of course, would practically be, that if the shareholder discovered the fraud practised upon him, and moved to be struck off the register before the failure of the concern, his application would succeed. But if he made no motion until after the winding-up had commenced, he would have to satisfy the creditors, and we think such a distinction would not be an unfair one.

Mr. Peake's case, being that of a transferee, was of course governed by *Duranty's case* (*ubi sup.*)—a case which, notwithstanding the objections frequently made against its principle, seems to have maintained an unshaken hold upon equity judges, and is unlikely to be ever overruled.

It is understood that, by an arrangement between the contending parties, the appeal on these two motions is to be carried direct to the House of Lords. Where, as in this case, the parties have made up their minds to fight the matter up to the highest Court, the expense of the intermediate appeal may well be spared. As we have before remarked, the question, though not a new one, is practically, having recurred on an unprecedented scale, receiving a reconsideration. It is perhaps one of the most important questions which have ever been decided by the Court of Equity, and its final settlement—whether by the Legislature or by the House of Lords—will be of incalculable advantage to the public.

DEEDS OF ARRANGEMENT WITH CREDITORS.

II.

(Continued from page 284.)

After stating the objection to the deed in *Ex parte Cockburn* already mentioned, viz., that to the assenting majority, the composition was to be paid down in hand, whilst the rest of the creditors had to rely on the debtor's covenant, the Lord Chancellor proceeded to say:—"But, further, it is clear that the creditors who are not named and described in the schedule, and have not executed the deed, could not sue upon the covenant of the debtor. The covenant is with the parties to the deed of the second and third parts, and as the deed is between parties, no person who is not a party could sue upon the covenant. This clearly follows from the settled principles of law which are illustrated by the cases cited in the argument." And again, in the judgment in *Laxton's case*, his Lordship said, "Upon this deed, according to the authorities cited upon a former occasion, and which settled the principles of the law, no one of the creditors who has not executed the deed could sue Laxton upon the covenant contained in it. I mean by the covenant, the covenant in the latter part of the deed, by which Laxton covenants with the several persons, parties thereto of the second and third parts, there being for the reasons I have already given *no persons who are parties of the third part.*" Now to the principle here laid down, that, if a portion of the creditors have the benefit of a covenant with them by the debtor, which is denied to the rest of the creditors, an inequality is created sufficient to vitiate the deed, no exception can be taken, and it has been affirmed in cases to which we shall presently call attention. But it would seem that it had no real application to the case of the deeds adjudicated upon in *Ex parte Cockburn*. All the non-executing creditors were there made parties of the third part, not *nominatim*, it is true, but as members of the class described, and as such might, it is submitted, have sued on the covenant. It is manifest, from different expressions used by the Lord Chancellor in his judgment, that he considered execution essential for the purpose of making a person a party, so as to enable him to sue upon a covenant contained in the deed. There are authorities, however, which show conclusively that a covenantee may sue, though he has not executed the deed containing the covenant; and all that the authorities on which the Lord Chancellor relies go to is, that no person can sue on a covenant who is not named as a party to the deed, but they none of them prove that you may not make several persons

parties by a general description, and there is, we believe, no authority to be found in support of such a proposition. We may add that there are ample grounds for sustaining the decision in *Ex parte Cockburn*, even if on the point to which we have referred the judgment was not well founded. The principle enunciated by the Lord Chancellor was shortly afterwards affirmed in the Exchequer Chamber, in the case of *Benham v. Broadhurst*, 13 W. R. 183, where it became absolutely necessary to decide the question. The deed there was made between the debtor of the one part, and the several executing creditors of the other part, and contained a covenant by the debtor with the several persons parties of the other part respectively to pay to all his present creditors a composition of five shillings in the pound on their respective debts. In delivering the judgment of the Court, Mr. Justice Crompton said, "The present deed, it will be observed, is made between the debtor and the executing creditors only, who take a covenant to them respectively and individually. There is no covenant by the debtor with the non-assenting creditors, or with any trustee for them, on which they or the trustee can sue. They have not, therefore, equal protection with the executing creditors, and the foundation of our judgment is that here the non-assenting creditors have not an equal right to sue—an equal right which is considered in effect an equivalent to so much property." A case (*The Chesterfield and Midland Silkstone Company v. Hawkins*, 13 W. R. 841) shortly afterwards came before the Court of Exchequer, in which the principle thus laid down was not disputed, but the question was raised whether it applied to the deed there brought under the consideration of the Court. By that deed, which purported to be made between the executing creditors of the first part, the debtor of the second part, and two sureties of the third part, the parties of the second and third parts covenanted with "the parties of the first part, and with all other the creditors of the debtor who are or shall be bound by these presents severally and respectively," to pay them a composition of ten shillings in the pound. It was objected to this deed that, although the covenant was with all the creditors, whether parties or not, yet those who were not parties to the deed, not being able to sue on the covenant, the deed had the vice pointed out in the cases we have just been considering. It was argued on the other side by Mr. Mellish, who did not dispute the technical rule relied on by the plaintiff, that the effect of section 192 of the Bankruptcy Act was to make the creditors bound by it actually parties to the deed, and that thus becoming parties by virtue of the statute, they could sue on the covenant. Baron Martin, however, in delivering judgment for the plaintiff, "felt constrained by the case of *Ex parte Cockburn*" to reject this argument, to which he would otherwise "have lent a willing mind." Baron Bramwell appears to have entertained some doubt which, we venture to think, was well founded, whether the case of *Ex parte Cockburn* was really conclusive of the point; but accepting the view of that case taken by the rest of the Court, he did not "think it worth while critically to examine the judgment in that case." In the case of *Gurris v. Ropera*, 34 L. J. Ex. 128, 13 W. R. 843, argued almost immediately afterwards, the deed was made between the executing creditors on behalf of themselves and all other the creditors of the debtor of the first part, and the debtor of the second part. After reciting that the debtor had agreed to pay a composition of five shillings in the pound, such payment or composition to be made and paid to all and every the creditors of the debtor, whether executing the said deed or not, to be paid and payable on a day and at a place mentioned in the deed, it contained a release by the creditors of their debts. This deed was held invalid, Baron Bramwell considering *Ex parte Cockburn* and *Benham v. Broadhurst* authorities to show that it was so. Baron Martin thought the deed bad on the authority of *The Chesterfield and Midland Silkstone Company v. Hawkins*. "It seems to me," he said, "that the non-assenting creditor has no action upon this deed."

It is very difficult to see what his rights are." The deed is, no doubt, most inartistically and clumsily framed, but it may be doubted whether it might not have been supported consistently with the previous decisions. The agreement recited in the deed would, according to *Lay v. Motteram*, 19 C. B. N. S. 479, create an implied covenant to pay the composition. Now, it is true, such covenant could be sued on only by the parties to the deed, viz., the executing creditors; but the covenant not being with each of such creditors, no action could be brought save in the name of all the executing creditors jointly, and, inasmuch as they become parties on behalf "of all other the creditors of the debtor," it might be contended that any non-executing creditor might equally sue on the covenant in the name of the executing creditors. The fact that the executing creditor would sue in his own name and that of the others executing, whilst the non-executing creditor, suing in the same names, would not himself be a party to the suit, would, it is submitted, not create such an inequality as to invalidate the deed. This view receives some support from the judgment in *Benham v. Broadhurst*, which proceeded on the ground that the covenant there was with the executing creditors "respectively," so that each one could himself have sued on the covenant, and it would rather seem that, had the covenant been joint, the decision of the Court might have been different. This point was argued before the Court of Exchequer in a case of *Hopkins v. Neuman*, but they considered themselves bound by the decision in *Gurria v. Ropera*, though the point now suggested does not seem to have been argued there.

In the next case on this subject, *Scott v. Berry*, 13 W. R. 845, the deed was supported. It purported to be made between the debtor of the first part, two sureties of the second part, and the creditors whose names and seals were subscribed and affixed, of the third part, and the deed contained a covenant with the parties of the third part respectively, similar to that in *Benham v. Broadhurst*, so that the deed was on the face of it subject to the same vice as the deed in that case, but it appeared at the trial that in point of fact no creditors had executed the deed and the Court consequently came to the conclusion that there being no parties of the third part there were no creditors who could sue on the covenant, and that there was consequently perfect equality amongst them.

In *Gresty v. Gibson*, 14 W. R. 284, the question how far a person who was a party to a deed by virtue only of being one of a class named as parties by their collective name, which really arose, as we have seen, in *Ex parte Cockburn*, though not definitely noticed in the judgment there, came before the Court of Exchequer for decision. The deed was made between the debtor of the one part and all the creditors of the other part, and contained a covenant by the debtor with "the said several creditors respectively," to pay "to the said creditors respectively" a composition of five shillings in the pound. Judgment was given upholding the deed on the authority of *Lay v. Motteram* (where this point does not appear to have been raised), but no reasons were given for the decision. In the subsequent case of *Reeves v. Watts*, 1 L. R. Q. B. 412, 14 W. R. 672, however, where precisely the same point was raised in the Court of Queen's Bench, Blackburn, J., gave judgment as follows:—"I think the decision in *Gresty v. Gibson* perfectly right. My own opinion certainly was strongly in favour of the proposition that a person may be made a party to a deed *inter partes* by description as belonging to a defined class, on the principle that *id certum est quod certum reddi potest*, and this view is much strengthened by the case of *Maughan v. Sharpe*, 34 L. J. C. P. 19, and particularly by the judgment of that very learned judge Sir E. Vaughan Williams."

The result of the cases with regard to the covenants in deeds under section 192 appears to be that if a deed is so framed that some creditors can sue individually on the covenants, whilst others cannot, the deed is bad; but

possibly a joint covenant with some of the creditors on behalf of themselves and the remainder of the creditors would not vitiate the deed. The statute does not operate to make the non-assenting creditors parties to the deed, so as to enable them to sue on a covenant contained in it. But a several covenant contained in a deed made between the debtor and all his creditors may be sued on by any person who, in point of fact, falls within this description.

(To be continued.)

EQUITY.

THE JUDGMENTS' LAW AMENDMENT ACT AND RAILWAY COMPANY'S LAND.

Gardner v. London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company; Ex parte Grissell, 15 W. R. 324.

In some recent remarks on the above subject,* with reference to the case *Re the Bishop's Waltham Railway Company*, 15 W. R. 96, we observed that that case "is an authority that, although no discretion is given by the Act, the Court is not bound to make an order for sale of the property delivered in execution, but will require first to see that this is a saleable interest." Since those observations were written, the subject has again come before the Court of Appeal in the principal case. In that case the sheriff had delivered in execution to Mr. Grissell, a creditor of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, some land which it appeared that the company had a short time previously advertised for sale by auction as surplus lands. Notwithstanding this fact the Court refused to make an immediate order for sale, but directed a series of inquiries similar to those which were directed in the case of *The Hull and Hornsea Railway Company*, 14 W. R. 758. Their Lordships are reported to have said that it would not be safe to make an order for sale without the certainty that the property was saleable, thus adopting the view of the Act which we attributed to them in our former observations.

REVIEWS.

Institutes of the Laws of Ceylon. By HENRY BRYERLEY THOMPSON, Second Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court. London: Trübner & Co. 1866.

This is an attempt to supply to that portion of the public interested therein that account of the unwritten law of the island of Ceylon which is, in England, to be found in our long series of reports. The author tells us in his preface that the Supreme Court has, for forty-three years, been engaged in "declaring" (i.e., we presume *settling*) the law of the island, but that, as there are no published reports, this law has not been made known, except partially, by means of certain limited collections. In other words, the Singhalese law is now (so far forth as its exponents are concerned) in very much the same state in which the law of England found itself in the interval between the cessation of the year-books and the commencement of Durnford and East's Reports. In the isolated collections of Levinz, Raymond, Saunders, and others, and the more pretentious, but still very imperfect, series of the Modern Reports, issued at long intervals according to the leisure or the caprice of the collectors, we have the prototypes of "Marshall's Judgments," "Morgan's Digest," and such other fragmentary compilations; while the great mass of the judgments of the Court had to be extracted from the records, documents peculiarly redundant of all that the reporter does not require, meagre to a proverb of all that he does—or cited from the recollections or MSS. of practising counsel, with the disadvantage, so well recognised here, of being at once more liable to reporters' errors, and less generally known to the profession.

To remedy this state of things before it is too late, before the mass of unreported judgments becomes unmanageable, or the authorities alone competent to supply omissions or rectify errors have passed from the scene, Judge Thompson comes forward, as a *deus ex machina*, not only to give to the profession "every one of the cases of any value as legal

* 11 Sol. Jur. 185.

authority," but to arrange and systematise them withal, so as to show the true uses of a record of judicial decisions, avoiding alike the absurdity of that school who, declaiming against "judge-made law," would require a distinct act of legislative intervention for the explanation of every difficulty, the interpretation of every ambiguity; and the evil of the contrary extreme—the more prevalent one amongst us—of resting on separate cases as isolated decisions, each embodying some proposition of law seldom capable of being stated in an abstract form, instead of combining them in groups or classes, from which definite abstract principles may without difficulty be deduced.

Those who object (and there are many such) to "our system of case-law," and would have every proposition of law embodied in a code, to which direct reference should on every occasion be made, we would remind that the Roman law (which is the foundation of the law of Ceylon) is one of the most completely codified and elaborated systems ever known, and therefore a singularly favourable subject for the application of this principle. And yet, what is the result, even in so favourable an instance as this, of the want of a published series of reliable reports? Let Mr. Justice Thompson answer in his own words:—

"The absence of a complete publication of these reports has led to litigation and error. The decrees of the Supreme Court, when unprinted, cannot afford instruction to the profession generally; and, consequently, that Court has had to decide the same points, often elementary points, over and over again, because the district judges, magistrates, advocates, and proctors, have had no proper reports to refer to; indeed, even the judges of the Supreme Court itself, having no index to its decisions, have elaborately adjudged many questions of law, in ignorance that these very questions had been as elaborately adjudicated upon years before by their predecessors; or have unwittingly overruled those predecessors, and even themselves."

This is the state of things to which the learned author has applied what we venture to consider a very sufficient remedy. In the work before us we have what seems to be a complete account of the present state of the law—not expressed, indeed, as a code would be, in a series of isolated propositions, still less as a digest proper, in a mere collection of decrees or authoritative *dicta*, but in the best class of text-book form, carrying with it more than the highest class of text-book authority. We have at once a readable account of Singhalese institutions for the enlightenment of the student, and a complete repository of Singhalese law for the reference of the Court and the profession. That in this he has been greatly assisted by the comparative smallness of the ground to be travelled over, is, of course, patent; but still this book seems to us an interesting specimen of what can be done, not so much in the way of codification or simplification of law, as of arrangement and compression of authorities; and a valuable precedent of a course which might easily, expeditiously, and advantageously be applied to the more prominent sections of the vast and daily increasing mass of our judicial reports.

We have hitherto spoken of Mr. Thompson's book principally as a guide to the right method of digesting and considering our English case law; it remains but to say that to those whose professional duty requires them to deal with Singhalese contracts or Singhalese land (and they are a numerous and constantly-increasing body), this work will be found invaluable down to its smallest detail; whilst to those who, without any special necessity leading them in that direction, nevertheless desire to improve their acquaintance with the jurisprudence of a most important colony, founded in great part on the most wide-spread system of law in the world, the earlier portions of which deal with the principal features of system as a whole, will be found full of valuable and highly interesting information.

If there be yet to be found in the profession anyone who neither desires a knowledge of general jurisprudence, nor an acquaintance with the law of any country but his own, and whose idea of legal learning ends as well as begins with Mr. Archbold's useful books and Mr. Morgan's "Chancery Orders," he, and only he, will have no interest in the work before us; but we should hope that such specimens are well nigh extinct.

A Book about Lawyers. By JOHN CORDY JEAFFRESON, Barrister-at-Law. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1867.

Mr. Jeaffreson has chosen both his subject and the name of his book well. An ancient and honourable profession,

followed for the most part by men of intellect, eminently conservative of antique forms and ceremonies, and abounding in literary and social reminiscence and quaint and interesting customs, affords to the antiquary a wide field for investigation. To the collector of witty and humorous stories it opens an almost inexhaustible store of anecdote. The mutual contact that sharpens wits, the readiness so necessary to successful advocacy, and possibly the antagonism that when tempered by gentlemanly feeling often gives point and zest to wit, have long made the pursuers of the law notorious for repartee, *mot* and story. A Book about Lawyers seems to offer a chance of combining antiquarian lore with the lighter entertainment, and giving us a book at once amusing and instructive. That Mr. Jeaffreson has failed in doing this is therefore not due to his subject. We cannot accord to Mr. Jeaffreson the contemptuous and somewhat amusing allowance that he makes for Lord Campbell's short comings, on the ground that "that energetic and eminent bookmaker, notwithstanding his fervent and creditable ambition for literary renown, could not spare time for research or systematic mental culture."

Mr. Jeaffreson is a bookmaker also, but his short comings are of quite another kind, and worst among them is that prolixity which is not inappropriately known as "padding." Stories or facts are related in the body of the work and then repeated at intervals in notes, or even appear in the text, and also in notes on the very same page, by way possibly of verification. "Nothing so tedious as a twice-told tale" is a maxim that admits of few exceptions. Why should we be told in every few pages that Lord Eldon in his note-book did not confine himself to fact, and that the early privations of handsome Jack Scott were the creation of the brain of mature Lord Eldon. Such repetitions may arise from the arrangement of the book under headings, but even then it would be better to leave a heading incomplete than thus constantly to bring forward the same subject time after time. Such padding seems to be accepted as a necessary evil in law books, especially those in explanation of a statute, where the separate sections of an Act are continually set out at length in the body of the book, and then repeated at the end in a continuous form by way of appendix. The evil, for pecuniary and other reasons bad enough in law books, is intolerable in such a work as the present.

To this same prolixity must also be attributed the hundred pages, which would bear being reduced to ten, devoted to "houses and householders" and "the loves of lawyers," and in which these subjects are treated with somewhat questionable taste. Under the latter heading we are treated to a chapter on Fair Rosamond, Jane Shore, and Nell Gwynn. Why these ladies should find a place in a book about lawyers is as incomprehensible as the rule, if any, which governs the foot notes to which many of the best stories are without reason relegated.

"Talk, if you can, to the point, but any how talk," may be the motto of advocacy; but it will certainly not do for a bookmaker to substitute "write" for talk, and then take the altered sentence for his motto, or the result may even be worse than, as in this case, the production of a book of which about a third is readable. Any one who is an adept in the art of judicious skipping may get considerable amusement out of these two volumes, which contain many of the best current stories, besides much that is interesting on the manners and dress of lawyers of old and comparatively modern times. Beyond this need of praise we cannot go, and we earnestly recommend the author to cure himself of this inveterate habit of padding, and next time he writes to keep more closely to his subject, on which conditions we shall welcome from his pen even, let us say, "A Book about Washerwomen."

COURTS.

COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

Feb. 12.—*Forster v. Mackreth.*—This case raised the liability of a firm of attorneys to pay a post dated cheque drawn by one member of the firm, as it was alleged by the defendants, in excess of his authority.

The COURT held that there was evidence of authority for the partner to draw cheques for the purposes of the firm. But that a post-dated cheque amounted, for all practical purposes, to a bill of exchange, and that in so drawing he had exceeded the scope of his authority.

Judgment for the defendant.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

SPECIFIC LEGACY.

Sir,—Will you or some of the readers of the Journal be so good as to give me an opinion on the following point:—A. makes his will on the 1st of January, 1866, by which, *inter alia*, he makes a bequest in these words:—"I leave my gold hunting watch to B." A., at the date of the will, had a watch corresponding to this description, which, subsequently to that date, he parted with. But a month before his death, in December, 1866, he bought another watch of a similar description, which he had at his death. I want to know if this watch passed to B. under the terms of his bequest.

RE-ARRANGEMENT OF THE LEGAL YEAR.

Sir,—Your correspondent, "a Barrister," in recommending a plan which is a slight improvement on that suggested by the law societies, retains precisely the same long vacation, namely, from August 27 to October 23. He says, of his scheme as a whole, that "the only general inconvenience which the majority of the judges and the bar will feel, will be the earlier commencement of Michaelmas Term." I venture to think that it is a very serious inconvenience to be robbed of the last fragment of our summer. Already we are worse off than Parliament, which, as a rule, is prorogued at the beginning of August, while we have to work a fortnight later. It will be intolerable if we are deprived also of the one fortnight out of the summer quarter which is as yet spared to us. Relaxation, in these days of hard work, is more than ever important, and to the bar, whose work lies in the atmosphere of London, or still worse, in stifly assize courts on circuit, more than to some other classes. September and October may be all very well for men whose amusement is shooting, though even to them, the cream of their pleasure is in August among the grouse, but to almost all the rest of the world August is far more valuable. As regards the younger men, cricket practically terminates with August; the Alpine summer very seldom lasts through September; Norway it is useless to think of, if one cannot start till August 28 or later; whilst in the British Isles, August is usually by far the finest month, and the best therefore for visiting the tourists' districts. Older men, with children at school, naturally desire to take them away from London during their summer holidays; and even Eton or Harrow, which follow aristocratic fashions, breaks up at the end of July. If fathers are busily at work during nearly all their children's summer holidays, and all their holidays at other times of year, what chance have they of seeing them? Men must either send their families away and remain alone at work, or keep them in town during the very time when they ought to be out of it. It may be hopeless to dream of vacation in July, with the long, hot, summer days spent in the enjoyment of fresh air, instead of working in a noxious atmosphere. The tyranny of the London season is perhaps too strong to rebel against, though no reason can be divined why Parliament should not meet a month earlier than it has done this year. But if changes are to be made in the arrangement of our legal year, let us rather put the long vacation earlier than later. Let us, in common sense and reason, add to the summer time allowed to us for relaxation, and not throw away for nothing the most valuable fortnight we now enjoy.

AUGUSTUS.

MODEL LAW REPORTING.

Sir,—Will you permit me through your columns to call the attention of the legal public, and particularly of law reporters, to a case which appears in the January number of the Law Reports, as showing what a strange and unprecedented stage of perfection the new system aspires to, and in fact realizes. It is seldom indeed that we find one so tied down by the nature of his work as a reporter who can glide with such an elegant facility from the dull regions of reality into the agreeable realms of fiction. O law reporters! (I do not mean the staff of the new publication) read this case carefully and you will be able to inaugurate a new era in the history of law reporting. Why should a dry narrative of what actually took place and what was actually said any longer weary the reader, when imagination can supply matter to vary the monotony of your reports?

The case of Smith and the Great Eastern Railway Company is reported in the January number of the Law Reports. (See 15 W. R. 131). It was an action against a

railway company by a person who had been bitten on the company's premises by a dog, not the property of the company or any of its servants, but which had found its way there. It appears that this dog had on previous occasions on the same evening shown signs of being dangerous. A verdict having been returned for the plaintiff, chiefly on the ground that the company had been guilty of negligence in permitting the dog to be on the platform, a rule nisi to set aside the verdict, on the ground that there was no evidence of negligence to go to the jury, had been obtained. During the argument Mr. Patehet (in support of the rule) said that it was not proved that the dog was the same as had appeared on the platform that evening before. Now, here is the delightful infusion from the phial of the imagination. The accomplished reporter makes Mr. Justice Willes say, "It was obviously the same dog. He presented the same appearance and conducted himself in the same way on both occasions." Now, I am informed that Mr. Justice Willes said nothing like this during the argument; and, certain it is, that neither the prosaic *Law Journal*, nor the tame *Weekly Reporter*, nor any other record of the case, contains this interlocutory oasis, on which the smiling reader may rest awhile before setting off again. He will probably find a few other smaller manifestations of creative power before he reaches his journey's end; but it is there that a thorough transformation scene awaits him. Fancy three judges in succession saying that they thought the rule should be made absolute, and giving their reasons for so thinking, and then, oh wonder of magic! without the slightest cause for a change of opinion, the rule is discharged! What an agreeable surprise for the reader. Really, law reporting will soon become sensational!

The public and the two branches of the profession must feel thankful to the editorial department for having so kindly co-operated in the endeavour to amuse us by not having expunged the parts which must prove so interesting to the readers of the "Law Reports."

May I, however, be permitted to suggest a somewhat closer attention to the rules of diction than the writer of this report seems to observe. Thus he writes, "The dog may have come in with a passenger, of whom there was a crowd on the platform." The writer may, perhaps, have intended this as a graceful ellipsis. Considering, however, the many other beauties in the report, it was almost superfluous to "add another hue into the rainbow" by this classic touch.

A DELIGHTED SUBSCRIBER TO THE "LAW REPORTS."

COURT OF PROBATE PRACTICE.

Sir,—For the information of my brother practitioners, and by way of protest against what appears to me an unwarrantable pretension of the officials of the Court of Probate, I beg leave to relate shortly in your columns what befel me lately in the principal registry of that court.

I was applying for the grant to a client of mine, as attorney for a widow resident abroad, of letters of administration, and tendered the usual papers for the purpose, including the power of attorney, which was impressed with a 30s. stamp. It appears that by an Act of Parliament which came into operation in August last, powers of attorney of this description, and which are intended to be filed in the registry, are exempt from duty, but of this I was then unaware. I had therefore erred in favour of the public revenue, by stamping a document which did not require stamping. Had the reverse been the case, and had I omitted a stamp where a stamp was required, my papers would properly have been rejected as defective on that ground, but I was quite unprepared for what followed. I was told that my papers would not be passed unless I gave a written undertaking that I would not charge my client with the stamp. I confess that I was very considerably astonished at this, but reflecting that it might be the simple caprice of a subordinate, I proposed to see the registrar on the point, and did so. I was still more astonished to find that this gentleman confirmed what his subordinate had stated, and refused to pass the papers unless I gave the undertaking. In vain I contended that the court's function was surely confined, under this head, to seeing that the revenue was not defrauded by the omission of a stamp where a stamp was required, and that it could not have any concern with the opposite case of a stamp too much, and that it was not proposing to allow me the stamp in any shape (in which latter case I have of course many times given the undertaking in affidavits for obtaining

allowance of spoiled stamps): all my arguments were in vain, and as I declined on principle to give the undertaking, my papers were returned to me. This proceeding on the part of the officials of the principal registry seems to me most unwarrantable and offensive, and I think should not be submitted to. My papers were confessedly in order, and being so, the court, it seems to me, has no right to add to its proper functions, that of assuming that I would improperly charge my client, and taking security that I do not do so.

A SOLICITOR.

[It seems to us that the question of allowing or disallowing the stamp was one for the taxing officer if and when the bill of costs was objected to, and could not properly be raised before.—Ed. S. J.]

Sir,—In answer to the *quere* put by "Apprenticius ad Legem," I would say that there is no doubt that the first interpretation he suggests is the correct one, though as far as the words and punctuation of the section are concerned, the second can fairly be deduced from it. Under these circumstances the only way of clearing up the difficulty is by reference to the common sense of the matter, and also to the course followed by a person applying for leave to proceed as if personal service had been effected. According to the second interpretation, there need not necessarily be an affidavit that there was no appearance. Now, the Legislature must surely have intended that the court or judge must *always* be satisfied of the non-appearance of the defendant, in order to prevent unnecessary applications; and as a fact, so far as my experience is concerned, there *always* is a statement that a search has been made, and that there is no entry of an appearance by the defendant, in addition to the other evidence required by the Act.

J. C. P.

THE NEW LAW COURTS.

Sir,—I have heard from various quarters, with what foundation I do not of course know, that the area of each of the courts in the structure about to be commenced is already determined on, and that, whatever plan may be adopted, it will not affect this determination. I have heard that the average size of the courts is to be about thirty by forty feet, or something about the size of the Bail Court at Westminster, and that there will be only one or at most two as large as the present Court of Exchequer. I hope this rumour is quite unfounded, for really if there be any truth in it, it will dishearten many members of the two professions who have been looking forward to the new courts as something not merely convenient and tastefully constructed, but as something noble, imposing, and grand interiorly as well as exteriorly. I have also heard that a very considerable portion of the area now defined and purchased for the courts is to be taken up by lodges and dwellings for the persons who will be employed in menial and similar occupations about the courts. I presume that there is some foundation for this, but surely one would think that there could be sufficient accommodation provided for such persons without so narrowing the space designed for the courts as to reduce them to a size which, no matter how handsomely they may be constructed, will completely disappoint the vast majority of the legal and general public. I sincerely trust that there is no foundation for these statements.

A BARRISTER.

[If the barrister will take the trouble to walk into the building now open in New-square, Lincoln's-inn, he will find that he is misinformed on both points.—Ed. S. J.]

APPOINTMENT.

Mr. Under-Sheriff CROSBY, solicitor, to be a commissioner for taking affidavits in Chancery and at Common Law.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, Feb. 11.

LAND TENURE (IRELAND).

The MARQUIS OF CLANRICARDE gave notice that on Monday next he should call attention to this subject, and should lay on their lordships' table a bill identical in substance, though not, perhaps, in language, with that which had been favourably received in the last session of Parliament.

Tuesday, Feb. 12.

THE LORD CHIEF BARON.

Earl RUSSELL presented a petition from Mr. Rigby Wason against Sir F. Kelly, praying for a committee to investigate the charges made in this petition; and if the committee should find these charges to be proved, then that the House would concur with the other House of Parliament in addressing the Crown to remove Sir F. Kelly from his high post. He declined, however, to ask the House to assent to the appointment of the committee asked for.

Lord St. LEONARD's requested that the prayer of the petition might be read by the clerk at the table, which was done.

The LORD CHANCELLOR, after some preliminary remarks upon the question whether if a petition is couched in respectful terms to the House, every peer ought to be ready to present it; and saying that he himself acted upon a different principle, and had exercised a discretion with reference to petitions which had been intrusted to him, proceeded to take up the paragraphs of the petition in detail, and completely refuted them *seriatim*. The principal charges were three in number. The first was:—

"That Sir Fitzroy Kelly, having been eleven years at the bar, and being Queen's Counsel, did upon the 11th of April, 1835, pledge his honour as a gentleman to the truth of that which he knew to be false, for the purpose of deceiving a committee of the House of Commons."

This charge was founded upon a statement (not, however, specifically put forward in the petition) that—

"Sir Fitzroy Kelly was returned to Parliament in 1834 with Mr. Dundas. A petition was presented by electors of Ipswich, supported by Mr. R. Wason, and the petitioners' counsel opened several distinct charges of bribery, among others, one of the most important as affecting agency was committed by Mr. Pilgrim. In reply, Mr. Kelly assured the committee upon his honour as a gentleman, that he had never heard of any person of the name of Pilgrim, and actually charged us (the petitioners) with having invented the story, which, he said, was almost proved by the very name we had selected."

The facts were that in 1834 Mr. Kelly was returned with Mr. Dundas, for Ipswich, and a petition, on the ground of bribery, was presented against their return. One of the charges was that one of the voters had been promised £20 by a man named Pilgrim, and that the money had subsequently been paid by that person. When the case arrived at the point when it was necessary to sum up on behalf of the sitting members, the counsel were all absent, and Sir F. Kelly was obliged to take the duty upon himself. It was untrue that in doing so he denied all knowledge of Mr. Pilgrim. On the contrary, he referred to him as a clerk in the employ of Messrs. Sewell & Blake, with whom he had frequently been in communication, and from whom he had received many briefs. What he contended was, that there was no evidence of agency, and that, consequently, there was no evidence against the sitting members. Soon after, a charge of embezzlement was preferred by Messrs. Sewell & Blake against Pilgrim, who had been keeping out of the way with a view to avoid the Speaker's warrant, and Pilgrim then went to the enemy's camp and appeared, and not only proved the act of bribery referred to, but also proved his own agency in the matter. The shorthand notes of Mr. Kelly's speech had been carefully searched through, and they did not contain the slightest foundation for the charge against him.

The second charge was conveyed in the following words:—

"That your petitioners humbly submit to your honourable House that the conduct of which Mr. Kelly was guilty was precisely the same, morally speaking as wilful and deliberate perjury to benefit himself, as stated by the late Lord Chief Justice Denman, who rebuked Mr. Kelly's counsel by remarking, in an indignant manner, 'Do not go on this, Mr. Attorney; this Court knows no distinction between when a man swears and what he says upon his honour as a gentleman.'"

This matter admitted of an easy explanation. At the election of 1837 Mr. Wason stated that Mr. Kelly had called God to witness that he had nothing to do with the absconding of Mr. Pilgrim to avoid the Speaker's warrant. In the criminal information which Mr. Wason afterwards filed against Mr. Kelly, he merely stated that he had asserted on his honour that he was no party to the absconding of Pilgrim. Mr. Kelly's affidavit denied that he had employed either of

the expressions, though he contended that both would have been true. The Attorney-General referred to the discrepancy in Mr. Wason's statements, upon which Lord Denman observed "that whatever a gentleman professes to declare, appealing to his own knowledge on the subject, must be taken to have been as solemnly made as if any obligation or any form of words had been appended to it." But in delivering judgment, Lord Denman expressed his opinion that there was no proof that Mr. Kelly had made use of the expression attributed to him.

The third charge was the following:—

"That your petitioner has been informed, and believes, that the late Sir Robert Peel, ten years afterwards, positively refused to appoint Mr. Kelly as his Solicitor-General, upon account of his conduct before the Ipswich Election Committee; and that the right hon. gentleman's legitimate scruples were overcome by a fraud."

This, as he (the Lord Chancellor) could of his own knowledge state, was false. Sir F. Kelly had been at once appointed by Sir R. Peel on Sir W. Follett's death, and this was announced to him (the Lord Chancellor) at the same time when he was informed of his own promotion to be Attorney-General. His lordship concluded:—What do your lordships think of this gentleman—the petitioner, who in this matter, has now been waiting for thirty years for an opportunity to bring forward charges of this description, when they were most likely to be injurious to the reputation of the right hon. gentleman? I think your lordships will be of opinion that the course which the petitioner has pursued upon this occasion has vindicated the character of the right hon. gentleman, which he branded in 1837, and that he has at last drawn out the poisoned shaft which has been steeped in venom for so long a time. He has aimed it at the right hon. gentleman and it has fallen harmless to the ground, and his petition will now lie upon your lordships' table a perpetual record of his falsehood and malignity.

Lord ST. LEONARDS appealed to Lord Russell to withdraw the petition.

EARL RUSSELL explained. It appeared to him that if petitions of that sort were refused by every peer, far more injury would be done than by the petition being brought into public debate in this House. In the first place, there would be the appearance of shutting the doors of this House against the petitions of the Queen's subjects; in the next place, the charges would be repeated in the newspapers, without the same opportunity to the party charged of answering them. He did what he considered to be his duty; took a copy of the petition to the Lord Chancellor, and asked him to have the goodness to communicate to the Lord Chief Baron the contents of the petition, so that when the petition was presented there might be a full opportunity of an answer to the charges which it contained. He was quite ready, if that was the right course, to withdraw the petition.

After a few words from The Earl of DERBY

EARL RUSSELL said: I beg, my lords, to withdraw the petition.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR.—The proper course will be to put the question to the House—that the petition do lie on the table? The Not-contents have it.

Thursday, Feb. 14.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS BILL.

On the motion of the EARL OF DERBY this bill was read a second time. He said it was his intention to propose the names of two members of the House of Commons as Commissioners, and he concurred in the suggestion that these gentlemen should be selected from different parties in the House. He proposed to consult with the Earl of Clarendon upon the subject, and name the gentlemen in committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, Feb. 8.

THE LAW OF FORFEITURE.

On the motion that the House should on its rising adjourn till Monday,

MR. C. FORSTER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it was his intention to introduce a measure for the abolition of the law of forfeiture on convictions of felony, founded on the provisions of the bill which obtained the assent of the House in the last session.

MR. WALPOLE.—I have referred to the bills of 1865 and 1866, and have found that although they both have the same

object they contain very different provisions. Nobody can doubt that no more careful person than my learned friend the late Attorney-General could have been engaged in preparing such a measure as this, and, therefore, I shall not be inclined to doubt any provisions which he may have inserted in his bill. At the same time there are provisions in the bill which I should like to consider before introducing that bill again. I will consult with the Attorney-General respecting this matter, and probably after that consultation I shall bring in a bill on the subject, though the provisions may not be altogether the same as those contained in the previous measure.

TRADES' UNIONS.

MR. WALPOLE obtained leave to introduce a bill for facilitating in certain cases the proceedings of the commissioners appointed to make inquiries respecting Trades' Unions and other associations of employers or workmen.

He also announced that the proposed commission to inquire into the operation of Trades' Unions consists of the following persons:—Sir W. Erle, chairman; the Earl of Lichfield; Lord Elcho, M.P.; Sir Edmund Head; Mr. Daniel Gooch, M.P.; Mr. Hermann Merivale; Mr. Matthews; Mr. Roebuck, Q.C., M.P.; Mr. Hughes, M.P.; Mr. James Booth; and Mr. F. Harrison.

THE CRIMINAL LAW.

THE RECORDER OF LONDON obtained leave to introduce a bill to secure the attendance and provide for the remuneration not only of witnesses whose evidence was necessary to establish the guilt of the prisoner, but also of witnesses who might establish his innocence.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL would offer no opposition to the introduction of the bill, the Government, of course, reserving to themselves the power to consider the clauses at a future stage.

Leave was then given to bring in the bill.

LAW OF LIBEL.

Leave was given to Sir C. O'LOCHLEN, Q.S., to bring in a bill to amend the law of libel, and thereby to secure more effectually the liberty of the press.

Monday, Feb. 11.

THE LAW OF MASTER AND SERVANT.

LORD ELCHO gave notice that he should on Friday next ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what were the intentions of the Government with reference to the law of master and servant.

THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF IRELAND.

In reply to Sir R. BLENNERHASSETT,

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND said that the Government hope to be able, in the course of a very few days, to submit a measure to Parliament to regulate the custody of the records and rolls of Ireland.

FALSE WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

In reply to LORD EUSTACE CECIL,

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT said that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a measure for the more effectual discovery and punishment of persons using false weights and measures.

Tuesday, Feb. 12.

THE LORD CHIEF BARON.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL presented a petition from the Lord Chief Baron denying the charges made against him by Mr. Rigby Wason, and praying that before any publication of the letter containing those false and scandalous allegations the House should ascertain the truth or falsehood of said allegations, or adopt such other course as to their wisdom and justice should seem fit.

On the motion of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL the petition was read by the clerk at the table.

RAILWAY DEBENTURES.

MR. WATKIN obtained leave to bring in a Bill to afford better security to the holders of railway debentures.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE was glad the hon. gentleman took the same view as he himself had ventured to express the other evening, namely, that it was desirable when cases such as those to which the hon. member referred arose they should be dealt with by special legislation. He believed there was unnecessary panic in reference to railway property.

TENURE OF LAND IN IRELAND.

Sir C. O'LOGHLEN, Q.S., in moving for leave to bring in a Bill to regulate and improve the tenure of land in Ireland, explained that it had nothing to do with compensation to tenants. Its object was to discourage tenancy from year to year.

ASSOCIATIONS OF WORKMEN.

Mr. NEATE asked for leave to bring in a Bill to exempt during a limited time associations of workmen which were, in respect of any part of their constitution, entitled to the benefits of the Act 18 & 19 Vic., c. 63, from forfeiture of those benefits by reason of their being in other parts of their constitution adapted to the purposes of a Trades' Union. The hon. member explained that his Bill was intended to overrule the case of *Hornby v. Closs*.*

Mr. WALPOLE.—The difficulty proposed to be dealt with is very great, as it will be necessary to draw a line between such societies as ought to take advantage of the Friendly Societies' Act and those societies which are contrary to law. Of course, I can give no opinion on the hon. member's measure till I have seen its provisions, but I shall not oppose the introduction of the Bill.

Leave was then given to introduce the Bill.

Thursday, Feb. 14.

COLONIAL BISHOPS.

In answer to Mr. Cardwell Mr. ADDERLEY said that a bill on this subject was about to be introduced in the other House.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL.

Mr. WALPOLE, in asking leave to introduce two bills relating to capital punishment, explained that the object of the first was to confine the punishment of death to murder with deliberate intention to kill, for the purpose of committing or aiding in the commission of rape, arson, or other felony, in aiding in the escape of other persons convicted of murder, or on public officers in the discharge of their duties. All other murders would be punishable by penal servitude for periods ranging from life to seven years, and the bill would also reduce the punishment for infanticide in certain cases. The second bill provided for the infliction of capital punishment within the walls of gaols, under certain securities.

Mr. BRIGHT expressed his regret at the form in which the distinction between the two classes of murder had been changed. The object of the commission was to do something like what is done in France, by the verdict of murder with extenuating circumstances. It was felt that the jury should know in what risk, and in what condition of risk, they were putting the prisoner. If he understood the right hon. gentleman, the jury would be left very much in the same position they were in at present, and if helped out of it, it would be only by the decision of the judge in particular cases. The object of the commission was to leave it to a large extent to the jury to decide in what list the criminal should be put.

Mr. W. EWART thought the right hon. gentleman had done well to adopt the definition of the House of Lords; but he considered with Sir F. Kelly that, resort to what contrivances they might, they never would arrive at a solution of this question without abolishing the punishment of death altogether.

Mr. GILPIN protested against the punishment of death. The time would come when it would be felt to be wiser, instead of tampering with the law, to do away with the punishment of death altogether.

Sir G. GREY said that the alteration made did not strike him as an improvement. Great advantage would have been secured if the division of murder into two degrees had been retained, allowing juries to decide into what class the criminal should fall. With regard to the second bill, the great argument that weighed with him in favour of executions within the walls of prisons was derived from the Australian colonies, where the practice was attended with complete success.

Mr. HIBBERT supported the bills.

Mr. HENLEY thought that the law should be so drawn up that the jury might clearly understand of what particular offence they were finding a man guilty, and that it should rest with them to find whether the offence was murder in the first or second degree.

Mr. NEATE would oppose the bill when it came before the House for discussion.

Mr. BAXTER asked whether the bills were to extend to Scotland and Ireland.

Mr. WALPOLE said it had been the intention of the framers of the bill to draw it up in accordance with the recommendation of the commission, except in the case of the murder of a policeman in the execution of his duty. In order to place the offences in the first class the jury would have to find that there was a deliberate intention to kill. If, in the opinion of hon. members, the bill failed to carry out the intention of the framers, he had no objection to its being amended.

Mr. M'LAREN thought that the provisions of the bill should be extended to Scotland.

Mr. WALPOLE said the attention of the Scotch law officers of the Crown would be drawn to the advisability of extending the provisions of the bill to Scotland.

IRELAND.

PROVINCIAL COURT OF DUBLIN.

Jan. 26.—*Shaw v. Shaw*.—In this case, which has been mentioned before,* Dr. Shaw made the following singular appeal to the Court:—My lord, may I direct your attention to a case, *Re Hooper; Bayliss v. Watkins*, 12 W. R. 324. This case is one which lays down, on the authority of Lords Justices Knight Bruce and Turner, what is the first duty of a wife's solicitor. I do not believe that one iota of the law as practised in England, and as it comes home to the bosom of every honest man, is understood in this country. The public, the profession, and the courts themselves, appear to consider that an attorney is as sacred an animal as the cow is to the Brahmans of India—that he may do what he likes: that he may take up a rotten case; that he may oppress a man whom he knows to be innocent; that he may torture him with a case that he dare not go into court with, and that he may do all this with perfect impunity. I would address your lordship's attention to the case which I have just quoted, and which was a case similar to this, and where a man instituted an action against a husband for adultery, and in which the Lords Justices that I have spoken of—two of the most eminent men in England—laid down that the first duty of a wife's solicitor was to have recourse to every source of information concerning the validity of the wife's case, and that if he neglected doing this, he should be held responsible for all the knowledge that he might have acquired if he had so applied himself. The first thing I did in this case was to tender to Mr. Brunker the fullest evidence—150 letters. I sent him two gentlemen, one of them an intimate friend of the petitioner, with documents in her own handwriting, all of which will, I hope, appear in this trial, and which will show the Court, and will also show the jury before whom I will go in the matter between Mr. Brunker and myself, that the case was one which Mr. Brunker should never have brought into court. The English law extends to this country, the difference in the nature of the courts from this being Ecclesiastical law does not touch the question. The law with respect to a wife's solicitor is the same. Mr. Brunker refused to look at the documents. He refused to listen to my friends, or rather they enforced him to listen. They read statements of her own, imploring me to take her back as an outcast. He knows that he read it, and he has the effrontery to come into this court in the character of an injured man.

THE COURT.—I do not know anything of this case outside the court. I say this in the presence of everybody, that so far as the Court has had the opportunity of judging of Mr. Brunker's conduct, it is quite satisfied that he has done in this case everything that those two learned judges say a wife's solicitor should do, and nothing more.

Mr. BRUNKER.—Thank you, my lord.

The parties then left the court.

MEANY'S CASE.

A true bill has been found by the grand jury against Stephen Meany for treason-felony.

SPRING ASSIZES FOR 1867.

CIRCUITS OF THE IRISH JUDGES.

CONNAUGHT—Carrick-on-Shannon, February 25; Sligo, February 28; Roscommon, March 4; Castlebar, March 7;

* 15 W. R. 336.

* 11 Sol. Jour. 292.

Galway Town, March 12. Justices—Christian, J., and Hughes, B.

HOME—Trim, February 28; Mullinger, March 4; Tullamore, March 6; Maryborough, March 9; Carlow, March 12; Naas, March 14—Whiteside, L.C.J., and Monahan, L.C.J.

LEINSTER—Wicklow, February 25; Wexford, February 28; Waterford and City, March 4; Clonmel, March 8; Kilkenny and City, March 14; Nenagh, March 18. Justices—O'Hagan, J., and George, J.

MUNSTER—Ennis, February 19; Limerick and City, February 22; Tralee, February 28; Cork, March 5; and Cork, March 8. Justices—O'Brien, J., and Fitzgerald, J.

NORTH-EAST—Drogheda, March 4; Dundalk, March 5; Monaghan, March 7; Armagh, March 11; Downpatrick, March 15; Belfast, March 20. Justices—Fitzgerald, B., and Deasy, B.

NORTH-WEST—Longford, March 5; Cavan, March 7; Enniskillen, March 11; Omagh, March 15; Lifford, March 20; Londonderry and City, March 23. Justices—Piggot, L.C.B., and Keogh, J.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

A lecture on "Limited Liability" was delivered by J. M. Solomon, Esq. (Reader of Equity at University College) at Clement's-in-hall, on Thursday, the 7th inst. Last Wednesday, at the same place, with Mr. Jennings in the chair, Mr. Handscomb moved "That where a will is lost, and evidence of its contents is given by parties who would not have been beneficially affected by it, probate should be granted." Mr. Colyar opposed. The motion was negatived. The Legal Correspondence Department, announced in another column, was declared in working order. There were twenty-seven members present.

THE LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the Law Institution, on Tuesday last, Mr. Kenrick in the chair, the question discussed was—"Is it desirable that the Crown should be empowered to create peers for life." The Debate was opened by Mr. Glynes in the negative, and continued by ten other speeches. The question was ultimately decided in the negative by 11 to 4. The number of members present having been 31.

CONFERENCE ON RITUALISM.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF LAYMEN ON EXCESSIVE RITUALISTIC PRACTICES.

The Committee appointed by the Conference on the 18th January, 1867, for the purpose of considering and reporting upon the best steps to be taken to arrest excessive Ritualistic practices within the church, with special reference to the following subjects—

1. An application to Parliament for a Declaratory Act;
2. An application to Parliament for a Royal Commission;
3. The presentation of Memorials to the Queen;
4. The presentation of Petitions to Parliament;
5. The holding of Public Meetings;
6. The adoption of Legal Proceedings;

report as follows:—

The practices principally complained of are these: the wearing of eucharistic and other unusual vestments; the use of incense; the adornment of the communion table as an altar, and the placing upon it of candles lighted in the daytime; the adoption of Romish devotional gestures and processions; the mixing of water with wine, and the use of wafer bread in the Holy Communion; and the offering of the Lord's Supper as a propitiatory sacrifice; and the elevation of the sacred elements for adoration by the people.

We believe that those who adopt these practices rely for their justification mainly upon the Rubric which immediately precedes the order for Morning Prayer, which Rubric was first introduced into the Prayer Book by the Act 1 Elizabeth, c. 2, sec. 25, with the following qualification, viz., "until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of Her Commissioners, appointed and authorized under the Great

Seal of England, for causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm."

"Other order" appears to have been speedily taken by the Queen's Majesty, for in the following year (1559), Queen Elizabeth issued certain injunctions, whereby, amongst other things, her Majesty commanded that "All Archbishops and Bishops, and all other that be called or admitted to preaching and administering of the Sacrament, and that be admitted into vocation ecclesiastical, or into any society of learning of either of the Universities or elsewhere, should use and wear such seemly habits and garments, and such square caps as were most commonly and most orderly received in the latter year of the Reign of King Edward the VI." and afterwards, certain Advertisements subscribed by the then Metropolitan of England, and by Commissioners appointed and authorised under the Great Seal in causes Ecclesiastical, wherein it was commanded "that any Minister saying any Public Prayer, or Ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves." These Injunctions and Advertisements were uniformly followed and enforced at law up to the year 1662, when the last Act of Uniformity (13 and 14 Car. II.) was passed. That Act authorised the use of the Book of Common Prayer now in use, containing the Rubric in question above, referring not to the "latter" but to the "second" year of Edward VI.

But although the retention of this Rubric, without reference to any further Order by the Sovereign, or to the Injunctions or Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth, is now said to have restored the obsolete vestment, the use of which had been then discontinued for more than a century; yet in fact for two centuries more these vestments were never used, but the dress prescribed by the Injunctions and Advertisements of Elizabeth continued to be the invariable costume of the clergy of the Church at the times of their ministration.

Recently, however, the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of *Liddell v. Westerton*, has introduced doubts as to the present validity of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions and Advertisements, and the result has been that in various churches both in the Metropolis and elsewhere, many innovations have been made upon the uniform practice of three centuries, and these innovations derive their importance from the fact that they are avowedly symbolical of doctrines which we hold to be false, and plainly repugnant to the teaching of the Church of England.

In fact, we cannot but entertain grave apprehensions that so long as that rubric remains in the Prayer Book without qualification, and the decision in the case of *Liddell v. Westerton* continues to be law, every clergyman may claim the right to wear the vestments and to use the other vessels or articles which were in use by the authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI.; and it is by no means certain that he may not be compellable to do so. But at any rate the non-user may expose him to the cost and vexation of prosecution with a very doubtful result, depending upon the evidence given of the articles or vessels and vestments used in various churches throughout the land three centuries ago.

The grievance occasioned by the uncertainty of the law is aggravated by the cost of prosecuting and defending an action in the Ecclesiastical courts as now constituted. On this point we quote the authority of Dr. Lushington, the Dean of Arches, who has spoken of the Church Discipline Act as obscure, cumbersome, and nearly unintelligible, and who says that "the confusion introduced by it knows no limits."

Many of the laity are deeply aggrieved by these innovations upon the long established mode of conducting Public Worship, and by the impossibility of restraining them without recourse to the Ecclesiastical Courts, the working of which has been thus strongly characterised by Dr. Lushington.

It follows from what we have stated that the interference of the Legislature is necessary—

1st. For the purpose of amending the Rubric above quoted in such a manner as to render it plainly conformable to the usage of the Church during the last three centuries, and to give full force and effect to the Injunctions and Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth.

2nd. For the purpose of amending the Church Discipline Act in such a manner as to provide a prompt, simple, and inexpensive remedy against such innovations in the mode of conducting Public Worship, and to give real and practical

efficiency to the provisions of the preface to the Prayer Book, in this respect.

They have therefore agreed upon the following recommendations to the conference.

1. That an invitation be sent to the leading members, both Lay and Clerical, of the Church of England, without distinction of party, requesting them to join in a deputation to the Prime Minister for the purpose of urging the Government the necessity of such Legislation as we have described. And that the Premier should be requested to advise her Majesty to issue a Commission which shall inquire into the propriety of amending the Rubric complained of, and of rendering the enforcement of Church Discipline in such matters prompt and inexpensive.
2. In the improbable event of the application to the Prime Minister being unsuccessful, then that some independent member of each House of Parliament should be requested to move for an address to the Crown praying her Majesty to issue a Royal Commission for the purposes set forth above.
3. That the proposed application for a Royal Commission be supported by memorials to the Queen from all parts of the country; but they are decidedly of opinion that it would not at present be desirable to hold a public meeting in London for the mere purpose of making a demonstration against ritualistic practices.
4. If the Premier should refuse to advise her Majesty to issue a Royal Commission, petitions from all parts of the country should be presented to both Houses of Parliament in support of the proposed address to the Crown.
5. They consider it unadvisable for this conference to institute a prosecution of any clergyman for the ritualistic practices in question.
6. Lastly, they cannot too earnestly and emphatically impress upon the conference the importance of regarding and dealing with this question in such a manner as to carry with them in their proposed solution of the present difficulty the largest possible number of members of the Church of England.

If the contemplated movement be confined to one party in the Church, failure is most probable, and even success will have the drawback of being a party triumph, and will increase disunion in the Church.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

LAW LECTURES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

Mr. R. HORTON SMITH, on Conveyancing, Monday, February 18.

Mr. E. CHARLES, on Equity, Friday, February 22.

LAW CLASSES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

Mr. E. A. C. SCHALCH, on Common Law, Monday, February 18, class A, elementary and advanced. Thursday, February 21, class B, elementary and advanced.

Mr. D. STURGES, on Equity, Tuesday, February 19, class A, elementary and advanced. Friday, February 22, class B, elementary and advanced.

Mr. A. BAILEY, on Real Property, Wednesday, February 20, class B, elementary and advanced.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

ENGLISH FUNDS AND RAILWAY STOCK.

LAST QUOTATION, Feb. 14, 1867

(From the Official List of the actual business transacted.)

GOVERNMENT FUND.

3 per Cent. Consols, 90½
Ditto for Account, Mar. 7, 90½
3 per Cent. Reduced, 90
New 3 per Cent., 90
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94 73½
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '76 —
Annuities, Jan. '80 —

Annuities, April, '85
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. pm
Ditto, £500, Do pm
Ditto, £100 & £200, Do pm
Bank of England Stock, 6½ per
Ct. (last half-year) 202
Ditto for Account,

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stock, 10½ p Ct. Apr. 74 214
Ditto for Account, —
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 107½
Ditto for Account, —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —
Ditto Enface Ppr., 4 per Cent. 84

Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p Ct. Jan. '72 107
Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '73 106½
Ditto Debentures, per Cent.,
April, '64 —
Do. Do., 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000, 30 pm
Ditto, ditto, under £1000, — pm

RAILWAY STOCK.

Shares.	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Prices.
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	87
Stock	Caledonian	100	120
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	116
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	30½
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2	100	8
Stock	Great Northern	100	121
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	128½
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	93½
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	50½
Stock	Do., West Midland—Oxford	100	35
Stock	Do., do.,—Newport	100	36
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	126½d
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	84
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	19
Stock	London and North-Western	100	122½
Stock	London and South-Western	100	86
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	49
Stock	Metropolitan	100	124 xd
Stock	Do., New	—	pm
Stock	Midland	100	123
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	93
Stock	North British	100	35½
Stock	North London	100	122
Stock	Do., 1864	5	7
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	70 xd
Stock	Scottish Central	100	162
Stock	South Devon	100	49
Stock	South-Eastern	100	68
Stock	Taff Vale	100	155
Stock	Do., C	—	4 pm

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

No. of shares	Dividend per annum	Names.	Shares	Paid.	Price per share.
5000	5 per cent	Clerical, Med. & Gen. Life	100	10 0 0	26 15 0
4000	40 pc & bs	County	100	10 0 0	85 0 0
40000	8 per cent	Eagle	50	3 0 0	6 17 6
10000	7½ ls 8d pc	Equity and Law	100	6 0 0	7 15 0
20 00	7½ ls 8d pc	English & Scot. Law Life	50	3 10 0	5 0 0
2700	5 per cent	Equitable Reversionary	105	—	94 0 0
4600	5 per cent	Do. New	50	50 0 0	14 0 0
5000	5 & 3 p sh t	Gresham Life	20	5 0 0	—
20000	5 per cent	Guardian	100	50 0 0	45 5 0
20000	7 per cent	Home & Col. Ass., Limtd.	50	5 0 0	1 10 0
7500	8½ per cent	Imperial Life	100	10 0 0	15 0 0
50000	10 per cent	Law Fire	100	2 10 0	5 0 0
10000	32½ pr cent	Law Life	100	10 0 0	89 0 0
100000	6 6-7 pr ct	Law Union	10	0 10 0	0 16 6
20000	6s p share	Legal & General Life	50	8 0 0	8 0 0
20000	5 per cent	London & Provincial Law	50	4 17 8	4 7 6
40000	10 per cent	North Brit. & Mercantile	50	5 0 0	6 0 0
2500	12½ & bs	Provident Life	100	10 0 0	38 0 0
689220	20 per cent	Royal Exchange	Stock	All	305
—	6½ per cent	Sun Fire	All	All	203 0 0
4000	...	Do. Life	All	All	63 0 0

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

Thursday Night.

It is matter of more than passing import and interest that the relations of capital and labour, a problem which has baffled the thoughtful of present and past generations, has at length so far forced itself upon public attention, that it will shortly receive Parliamentary inquiry and scrutiny, and it is to be hoped it will be satisfactorily settled. Panics such as the Spring of 1866, one not more destructive of the just balance of enterprise than those constant checks which, during the past few years, have been again and again experienced, arising out of combinations, whether on the part of employers or employed.

The long prevalent dullness which, for some time past, has been prevalent, has not yet yielded greatly to the abundance of money and low rates of accommodation. There is, however, greater strength apparent, and it is confidently anticipated that we shall have a busy spring.

The news of the Fenian uprising in Kerry, and the suspicious aggregation of strangers at Chester caused the funds to relax to day; and Consols are 90½ to 90¾ for money; and 90½ to 90¾ for the account.

The Bank return gives the following results:—Private securities have decreased £398,876, the total being £18,317,942. The reserve of notes has increased £516,825, the aggregate reaching £10,587,295. The stock of bullion is £19,177,382, an increase of £153,189. Public deposits show an increase of £273,243, and private deposits a decrease of £791,330.

The Bank of France return is satisfactory; and the stock of bullion has increased half-a-million.

Railway shares remain inactive, there being few transactions as investments. However, as the dealings are so restricted, it is quite clear that *bona fide* holders are not selling. The traffic receipts, in many instances, have greatly improved; but it must be borne in mind that in many instances they are earned upon increased mileage.

The Great Eastern, it is said, purpose voting a sum of £5,000 to Mr. Laing for financial services. He has been elected Deputy-Chairman of the company.

With reference to the affairs of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company, it is stated that a conference is about to be held between the directors and debenture-holders to see whether an amicable arrangement cannot be arrived at.

Bank shares are held steadily and prices continue to rate firm, the latest prices are:—London Joint-stock, 43 42½ and 42½; London and County 65 and 64½ ex div.; London Chartered Bank of Australia, 22½; Chartered Mercantile, 34½ and 34; Bank of Egypt, 32½ ex div.; Metropolitan, at 8½; National Provincial, second and third issue, 39½; Oriental Bank, 43½ and 43; Bank of Australasia, 67½ and 67; the Colonial, 40½; and Union of London, 45½ and 44½. City, 13½ to 14½; London and Westminster, 94 to 96; National, 63 to 65; and the Union Bank of Australia, 47 to 49.

Pace's Leicestershire Banking Company has declared a dividend at the rate of 14 per cent. per annum.

Insurance companies' shares are very firm, and late quotations are well supported.

On Monday last Lord Romilly dismissed the petition to wind-up the Mercantile Marine Insurance Company with costs.

Credit, Finance, Discount, and Miscellaneous Shares are neglected; but prices are not lower than they have been for some time past. This evening's quotations are the following:—London Finance, 18 to 17 dis., showing a fall of ½; General Credit, ½, to 2½ dis.; International, ½, to 2½ to 2½ dis., and Credit Foncier steady at 5½ to 5½ dis.; Discount Corporation, 13 to 11 dis.; the New Consolidated, 1 to 0½ dis.; and the National Discount, 8½ to 9 prem. The Shares of the British and American Telegraph Company (Limited) were quoted ¾ to 1½ prem.; the Anglo-American, 15½ to 15½ per share; the Eight per Cent. Preference were, however, maintained at 2½ to 3 per share.

At the meeting of the Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company (Limited), a dividend of 8 per cent. on Preference shares, and 3 per cent. on ordinary Stock, was declared.

The meeting of the Credit Foncier of England is convened for the 18th inst. The report says the profit and loss account does not admit of the declaration of a dividend.

At the meeting of African Merchants (Limited), a dividend of 4s. 6d. per share was declared, carrying forward £10,000.

A petition has been presented to wind-up the Marseilles Extension Railway and Land Company (Limited).

CAUSES BEFORE THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—Among the Irish causes which will be heard before the House of Lords on appeal this Session, is one—*Conolly v. Luscombe*—which was set down in the session of 1857! Ten years' delay before judgment is pronounced seems to be a tolerably stiff delay even for a Chancery cause, as this is*. Another case—*Long v. Long, et al*, was set down in the Session of 1863. It is also an appeal from the Irish Court of Chancery. So are the cases of *Barry et al v. Brereton*, and *Little (pauper) v. Comyn* and another which were set down in the Session of 1865. The other Irish cases set down last year, and now to be heard, are the following:—*Carlisle and Another v. Whaley* (in error)—an appeal from the Exchequer Chamber, Ireland; *Thorp v. Browne*; and *Cooper v. Phibbs et al*. The Earl of Mornington's claim to vote for representative peers for Ireland will also be investigated this session. Mrs. Longworth Yelverton's appeal from the last decision of the Court of Session against her will probably be among the first cases tried. This lady is now compelled to appear before their lordships *in forma pauperis*.

A CORONER ON COURTSHIP.—At a coroner's inquest in Wiltshire, the other day, the following extraordinary dialogue took place.—Coroner (to old man, husband of deceased): Had your wife a cough when you married her? Witness: Yaas, sur.—Coroner: Than how came you to be so foolish as to marry a woman with a cough? Witness (scratching his head): I don't know, sur. I s'pose I liked her.—Coroner: But why did you not have her examined by a medical man before you married her? Witness: She seemed healthy enough to I, sur.—Coroner: I wonder you married a woman with a cough. I think if persons contemplating matrimony were to give a surgeon a fee for a certificate certifying that the woman was of sound health, it would prevent many melancholy spectacles we are often called to witness.

* This must have arisen from the conduct of the parties themselves; at least one cause set down in 1865 was heard in 1866.—Ed. S. J.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

Feb. 6.—By Messrs. BREWER & SONS.

Freehold, about 9 acres of building land, fronting Kingston-road—Sold for £5,000.

By Messrs. DENT & SONS.

Leasehold residence, No. 58, Oakley-square, let on lease at £65 per annum; term, 99 years from 1851, at £7 per annum—Sold for £750.

Feb. 12.—By Mr. THOMAS PAYNE.

Leasehold, 4 houses with shops, Nos. 12 and 13, Harper-place, and 1 and 2, Back-road, St George's East; estimated annual value £115; term, 25 years unexpired at £9 12s. per annum—Sold for £430.

Leasehold, manufactory with house and shop adjoining, situate in Back-road, St George's East; estimated annual value £165; term, 21 years from 1864, at £70 per annum—Sold for £708.

Leasehold, 5 houses with shops, Nos. 55 to 59, North Woolwich-road, and a house No. 13, Sabbarton-street, North Woolwich-road, producing £200 per annum; term, 90 years from 1852, at £15 15s. per annum—Sold for £1,470.

AT MASON'S HALL.

Feb. 7.—By Mr. JOHN HENSHAW.

Lease of the Prince of Orange wine and spirit establishment, situate in the Greenwhich-road, Greenwich—Sold for £5,470.

Feb. 11.—By Messrs. BAILEY, FRER, & WYER.

Lease, &c. of the Bricklayers Arms Public House, and 3 houses adjoining, situate in Curtain-road, Shoreditch—Sold for £3,100.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

DAVIES—On Feb. 11, at Camden-house, Blackheath, the wife of Edmund Davies, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

DOBINSON—On Feb. 8, at Stanwick, Carlisle, the wife of Henry Dobinson, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

DODD—On Feb. 7, at Wallingford, Berks, the wife of John T. Dodd, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

GELLATLY—On Feb. 11, at Loughton, Essex, the wife of Peter Gellatly, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

LARGE—On Feb. 10, at Leamington, the wife of C. E. Large, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

MASON—On Feb. 8, at The Limes, St. John's-wood-park, the wife of John Nicholas Mason, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

MEYLER—On Feb. 7, at 4, The Crescent, Taunton, the wife of Thomas Meyler, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

SWIFT—On Feb. 2, at Richmond, the wife of Richard Leringe Swift, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

SPAULL—SCOTT—On Feb. 7, at St. Saviour's Church, Maida-vale: Alfred Cross Spaull, Esq., Solicitor, Veralam-buildings, Gray's-inn, son of Bernard Spaull, Esq., of Kensington, to Elizabeth Charlotte, daughter of J. J. M. Scott, Esq., of 6, Westbourne-terrace-road.

THESIGER—HEATH—On Jan. 1, at Kurrache, Scinde, Colonel the Hon. Frederick Augustus Thesiger, H.M.'s 95th regiment, to Adria Fanny, daughter of Major-General John Consamaker Heath, commanding Scinde Division of the Bombay Army.

WARNER—EASTALL—On Feb. 12, at the Abbey Church, Sherborne, Frederick Isaac Warner, Esq., Solicitor, of Winchester, to Isabel Temple, daughter of the late G. F. H. Eastall, Esq., of the Hon. East India Company's Medical Service.

DEATHS.

DAVIS—On Feb. 12, Catharina, the wife of Michael Davis, Esq., Solicitor, of Usk.

KNOWLES—On Feb. 12, at his residence, Hurst Green, Sussex, Charles James Knowles, Esq., Q.C., and Bencher of the Middle Temple, aged 68.

PHILLIPS—On Feb. 6, James Phillips, Esq., Solicitor, of 11, Abchurch-lane, City, and The Terrace, Camberwell, aged 77.

RENNY—On Feb. 9, at Calce, Wilts, Frances Elizabeth, daughter of William Rennie, Esq., Solicitor, aged nearly 6 months.

ROBINSON—On Feb. 5, at 30, Russell-square, Henry Crabb Robinson, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, aged 92.

STEVENS—On Feb. 11, at 17, Eaton-place, Brighton, Henry Stevens, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of the Middle Temple, aged 53.

STONE—On Feb. 6, at Llanbedrog Rectory (the residence of her son-in-law, the Rev. T. Caesar Owen), Elizabeth, relict of the late Samuel Stone, Esq., Solicitor, Macclesfield, aged 89.

TUCKETT—On Feb. 7, at 35, Onaburgh-street, Regent's-park, Gertrude, daughter of the late George Lowman Tuckett, formerly Solicitor-General of Granada, and Chief Justice of the Island of Jamaica.

WINNER—On Feb. 5, at his residence, The Limes, Northbarch, Berk-hampstead, Herts, Charles Winner, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, aged 38.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Including-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Feb. 8, 1867.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Metropolitan Railway Warehousing Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Feb. 6, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls on Feb. 16. Fryer, Gray's-inn-place, solicitor for the petitioner.

West Midland Brewery and Malting Company (Limited).—Creditors are required, on or before March 4, to send their names and addresses

and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Dod Baker, Kidderminster. Wednesday, March 13 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
Merchants' Company (Limited).—Time for sending in claims has, by an order made by the Master of the Rolls, been extended to Saturday, Feb. 23. Thursday, March 14 at 1, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

TUESDAY, Feb. 12, 1867.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Marseilles Extension Railway and Land Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 11, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Malins on Feb 22. G. S. & H. Brandon, Essex-st, Strand, solicitors for the petitioner.

Gartness Iron and Steel Works Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 9, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Wood on Feb 23. Upton & Co, Austin-friars, solicitors for the petitioners.

Ormskirk Chemical, &c., Company (Limited).—Order to wind up, made by the Court of the County Palatine of Lancaster on Feb 7. Wareing, Ormskirk, solicitor for the petitioner.

Continental Gas and Water Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 7, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Malins on Feb 22. Wilkins & Co, St Swithin's-lane, solicitors for the petitioner.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, Feb. 8, 1867.

Bridgeman, Wolryche, Arthur Charles Orlando, Dorchester-st, Blandford-sq, Esq. March 6. **Bridgeman v Bridgeman, V. C. Malins.**
Edlin, Mary Ann, Cambridge, Widow. March 2. **Edlin v Bye, M. R.**
Harrison, John Newton, Appleby, Westmoreland, Gent. March 8.
Wilkinson v Bell, V. C. Malins.
Penaluna, Wm, Helstone, Cornwall, Printer. March 5. **Penaluna v Edwards, M. R.**
Parsonage, Thos, Ashton, Chester, Farmer. March 2. **Parsonage v Taylor, V. C. Wood.**
Wormald, John Upper Harley-st, Esq. March 14. **Frampton v Wormald, V. C. Stuart.**
Wright, Chas, Old Kent-rd, Gent. March 1. **Brewerton v Gilbert, M. R.**

TUESDAY, Feb. 12, 1867.

Almond, Geo, St James's-st, Army Accountant Maker. Feb 21.
Almond v Surman, V. C. Stuart.
Farhall, Richd, Billingshurst, Sussex, Yeoman. March 6. **Farhall v Farhall, V. C. Wood.**
Osborn, Wm, Queen-st, Chelsea, Builder. March 8. **Osborn v Osborn, V. C. Malins.**
Tomlinson, John, jun, Argyll-st, York, Yeoman. March 31. **Thistlethwaite v Wian, V. C. Stuart.**
Trevend, Nicholas, Redruth, Cornwall, Auctioneer. Feb 23. **Trevend v Ineff, M. R.**
Tulloch, John, Dawson-pl, Bayswater. March 1. **Everingham v Tulloch, M. R.**

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Feb. 8, 1867.

Alchin, Wm, Linton, Kent, Yeoman. May 8. **Ottaway, Maidstone.**
Brown, Edmund, Newbiggin, Westmoreland, Yeoman. April 1.
Thompson, Appleby.
Carpenter, Danl, Brighton, Sussex, Yeoman. March 23. **Hart & Hart, Dorking.**
Clayton, Joshua, Springrow, Manningham, York. March 19. **Leeds & Senior, Bradford.**
Clement, Ann Maria, Bristol, Widow. April 10. **Hunt, Bristol.**
Bringing, Thos, Devonshire-row, Mews, Portland-pl, Cab Proprietor. March 24. **Kinsey & Co, Bloomsbury-pl.**
Fowler, Geo Wm, Wavertree, nr Lpool, Gent. March 10. **Norris & Co, Lpool.**
Grugeon, Jas Isaac, Winchmore-hill, Stock Broker. March 30. **Randall, Gracechurch-st.**
Harmer, John Dalton, Ipswich, Suffolk, Gent. May 1. **Notcutt, Ipswich.**
Lemon, Robt, Ovington-sq, Brompton, Esq. March 25. **Cooper, Guildford-st.**
Page, Wm, Carleton Road, Norfolk, Farmer. March 20. **Mitchell & Clarke, Wymondham.**
Palmer, Sir Geo Joseph, Wandip Hall, Leicester, Bart. March 18.
Cookson & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn.
Sergeant, John, Etruria, Stafford, Butcher. March 11. **T. H. & F. W. Tomkinson, Burslem.**
Smithson, Thos Wm, Cranbourne-st, Leicester-sq, Shawl and Mantle Manufacturer. March 8. **Parker & Co, St Paul's Churchyard.**
Somerville, Hon Fred Noel, East Close, Southampton. May 7. **Bennett & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn.**

TUESDAY, Feb. 12, 1867.

Abraham, Saml, Kembston, Gent. March 20. **Turnley & Sharman, Bedford.**
Ames, Jane, Bethnal-green-rd, Widow. March 20. **Donne, Prince's-st, Spitalfields.**
Bisacks, Saml, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. May 6. **Gillard, Bristol.**
Booth, Mary, Glossop, Derby, Spinster. March 11. **Parker & Son, Sheffield.**
Crawshaw, Timothy, Pontefract, York, Auctioneer. Feb 28. **Holmes, Pontefract.**
Davis, Danl, Lunatic Asylum, Hanwell, Gent. April 9. **Miller, Hants-pl.**
Dickinson, Geo, Ecclesfield, York, Tiltar. March 11. **Parker & Son, Sheffield.**
Guthrie, Julia, Riley-st, Chelsea, Widow. March 7. **Reynell, Staple-inn.**
Honywood, Drew, Horsham, Sussex, Gent. March 25. **Medwin & Clarkson, Horsham.**

Hudson, Wm, Margate, Kent, Livery Stable Keeper. March 14. **Brookes & Hughes, Margate.**
Keate, John, Tonbridge, Kent, Architect. March 1. **Meymott, Albion-pl, Blackfriars-bridge.**
Kirkley, John, Sheriff-hill, Durham, Farmer. April 5. **Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.**
Robinson, Joseph, Tanfield, Durham, Farmer. April 6. **Hoyle & Co, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.**
Staite, Hannah Jane, Bristol, Widow. March 22. **Heaven, Bristol.**
Stamp, Sarah, Poland-st, Oxford-st, Widow. March 21. **Lewis, Chancery-lane.**
Sugden, Charlotte, Riley-st, Chelsea, Spinster. March 7. **Reynel, Staple-inn.**
Thorold, Sir John Chas, Syston-park, nr Grantham, Lincoln, Bart. May 1. **Tallent & Co, Newark-upon-Trent.**
Wallace, John, Long-lane, Bermondsey, Carrier. May 8. **Hepburn & Son, Cophall-court.**
Wilson, Ann, Haverthwaite, Lancaster. April 1. **Butler, Dalton-in-Furness.**
Wynne, Jos, Guisborough, York, Innkeeper. March 11. **Weatherill & Lloyd, Guisborough.**

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, Feb. 8, 1867.

Anderson, Ann, Brandon-st, Walworth, Widow. Jan 25. **Comp. Reg Feb 6.**
Aspinall, Mary Ann, Lpool, Milliner. Jan 24. **Asst. Reg Feb 7.**
Bell, John, Boothon, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Jan 11. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Brown, John Thos, & Thos Wilson, Pontefract, York, Refined Juice Manufacturers. Jan 23. **Asst. Reg Feb 7.**
Bucherer, Chas Wm, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Doctor of Philosophy. Jan 11. **Comp. Reg Feb 6.**
Colton, John Caspar, Lpool, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Jan 15. **Asst. Reg Feb 6.**
Cooper, Benl, Eden-ter, Battersea, Builder. Jan 10. **Asst. Reg Feb 5.**
Crabb, John, Leighton Buzzard, Bedford, Ironmonger. Jan 9. **Asst. Reg Feb 4.**
Crocher, Stephen, Bridgwater, Somerset, Innholder. Jan 11. **Comp. Reg Feb 8.**
Cummins, Jas, Manchester, Boot and Shoe Dealer. Jan 31. **Comp. Reg Feb 8.**
Curry, Jas, Bristol, Filer. Jan 31. **Comp. Reg Feb 2.**
Eglinton, Jas, Sunderland, Durham, Gent. Jan 9. **Comp. Reg Feb 6.**
Eliot, Wm Kyd, Cornwall-rd, Westbourne-pk, Solicitor. Feb 6. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Francis, Jas, Lilanely, Carmarthen, Publican. Jan 11. **Comp. Reg Feb 8.**
Glaister, Geo, Lpool, Builder. Jan 28. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Greenwood, John, & Jas Greenwood, & Jas Greenwood, Halifax. Jan 25. **Comp. Reg Feb 1.**
Hacker, John, Swindon, Wilts, Grocer. Jan 9. **Comp. Reg Feb 6.**
Hall, Richd, Oxford-st, Tailor. Jan 9. **Comp. Reg Feb 6.**
Hampton, Jas, Clyde-villas, Albert-rd, West Ham, Builder. Jan 25. **Comp. Reg Feb 8.**
Hare, Geo, Lower Calthorpe-st, Gray's-inn-rd, Manufacturer of Photographic Apparatus. Jan 11. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Harrison, Wm Deacon, Walsall, Stafford, Tailor. Jan 22. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Harring, Christopher, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Builder. Jan 30. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Hawdon, John Crozier, Addle-st, Aldermanbury, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Jan 23. **Comp. Reg Feb 9.**
Hellyer, Robt, Eleanor-ter, Devonshire-rd, Croydon, Builder. Nov 22. **Asst. Reg Feb 6.**
Hey, Ishmael, Denholm, York, out of business. Jan 24. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Hunt, Bennett, Manch, Bill Broker. Feb 1. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Jonas, Thos, Chester, Plumber. Jan 17. **Asst. Reg Feb 7.**
Leith, Daniel Hy, Old Kent-rd, Draper. Jan 28. **Comp. Reg Feb 5.**
Ito, John Wm, Stourbridge, Worcester, Builder. Jan 21. **Asst. Reg Feb 6.**
Lilley, John, Swansea, Glamorgan, Publican. Jan 17. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Lewellyn, Thos, Newport, Monmouth, Builder. Jan 11. **Asst. Reg Feb 7.**
Marshall, Thos Hy, Kingston-upon-Hull, Iron Merchant. Feb 5. **Comp. Reg Feb 6.**
Midgley, Jas, Harborne, Stafford, Provision Dealer. Jan 10. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Morgan, Wm, Cinderford, Gloucester. Jan 15. **Asst. Reg Feb 7.**
Morrison, Wm, Cheltenham, Hatter. Jan 28. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Mudd, Woodward Wm, Eyre, Suffolk, Grocer. Jan 14. **Asst. Reg Feb 6.**
Naylor, John, Bailife Bridge, Wike, York. Jan 11. **Asst. Reg Feb 7.**
Packard, Hy, Norwich, Merchant. Jan 14. **Asst. Reg Feb 7.**
Porter, Joseph, Walsley, Salford, Lancaster, Screw Bolt and Nut Manufacturer. Jan 21. **Comp. Reg Feb 8.**
Pratt, Robt, New Wortley, Leeds, Provision Dealer. Jan 23. **Asst. Reg Feb 5.**
Rosenborn, Abraham Marks, Manch, Tailor. Jan 21. **Comp. Reg Feb 6.**
Rowe, Chas Jas, Malden-rd, Haverstock-hill, Mercantile Clerk. Jan 10. **Comp. Reg Feb 6.**
Roe, John, Ut Yarmouth, Norfolk, Corn Dealer. Jan 12. **Asst. Reg Feb 5.**
Russell, Thos, Walsall, Stafford, Ironfounder. Jan 8. **Comp. Reg Feb 4.**
Russell, Jonathan, & Saml Baintow, Clayton Heights, York, Joiners. Jan 24. **Asst. Reg Feb 8.**
Sarl, Abraham, & Joseph Sarl, Walbrook, Silvermiths. Jan 20. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**
Score, Geo, Alexandra-villas, Acton Vale, Financial Agent. Jan 29. **Comp. Reg Feb 8.**
Sharp, Wm, John Laurie, & Leonard Cooper, Iron Merchants, Manch. Jan 30. **Asst. Reg Feb 6.**
Simmonds, Herbert, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Jeweller. Jan 17. **Comp. Reg Feb 7.**

Smith, Hy, Willington, Durham, Grocer. Jan 18. Asst. Reg Feb 7.
 Smith, Wm Digby, Geo Fredk Preston, Wm Geo Kellick, & Saml
 Breuen, Lpool Merchants. Jan 18. Conv. Reg Feb 6.
 Smith, Arthur, Wellington-ter, St John's-wood, Clerk. Jan 9. Comp.
 Reg Feb 6.
 Swanborough, Wm Hy, Brompton-rd, Brompton, Theatrical Manager.
 Jan 31. Comp. Reg Feb 8.
 Taylor, Chas, High-st, Stratford, Painter. Jan 18. Comp. Reg Feb 7.
 Taylor, John, Manch, Grocer. Jan 14. Asst. Reg Feb 5.
 Thevenard, Adolphe Chas, London-st, Merchant. Jan 31. Comp.
 Reg Feb 7.
 Tweedle, Mary Anne, Little Bolton, Lancaster, Grocer. Jan 11. Asst.
 Reg Feb 6.
 Walker, Geo, South Hylton, Durham, Blacksmith. Jan 12. Asst.
 Reg Feb 6.
 Whitbread, Jas, Hartford-rd, De Beauvoir-town, Tailor. Jan 18.
 Comp. Reg Feb 7.
 Williams, Thos, Dudley, Worcester, Boot Manufacturer. Jan 29.
 Comp. Reg Feb 7.
 Williams, Alf, Muswell-hill, Photographer. Jan 19. Comp. Reg
 Feb 9.
 Woodburn, Hugh, Birm, Draper. Jan 14. Asst. Reg Feb 7.
 Wood, John, Beaufort-st, Chelsea, Bill Poster. Feb 6. Comp. Reg
 Feb 8.
 Young, David, Egham, Surrey, Grocer. Jan 24. Asst. Reg Feb 7.

TUESDAY, Feb. 12, 1867.

Almond, Thos Dobson, Anfield, nr Lpool, Grocer. Feb 8. Comp.
 Reg Feb 11.
 Baxter, Joseph, Newington-rd, Gas Engineer. Feb 6. Comp. Reg
 Feb 12.
 Bird, Thos, Robt Adnam, & Robt Povey, Westbromwich, Stafford.
 Whitesmiths. Jan 17. Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Brend, John, Bideford, Devon, Bootmaker. Feb 1. Comp. Reg
 Feb 9.
 Carmichael, Robt, & Robt Hardman, Kirkham, Lancaster, Cotton
 Manufacturers. Jan 15. Asst. Reg Feb 11.
 Cattle, Alfred, Darlaston, Staford, Grocer. Feb 6. Comp. Reg
 Feb 9.
 Cooper, Wm, Bedford-pl, Russell-sq, Gent. Feb 11. Comp. Reg
 Feb 11.
 Compton, Edwin, Leicester, Grocer. Jan 25. Conv. Reg Feb 9.
 Cox, Geo, Solihull Lodge, Warwick, Retail Brewer. Jan 31. Asst.
 Reg Feb 11.
 Crossland, Jas, Bury, Lancaster, Spindle Maker. Feb 4. Comp. Reg
 Feb 11.
 Collinson, Thos, & John Collinson, Halaham-in-Holderness, York,
 Farmers. Jan 22. Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Dark, Edwd, Barnstable, Devon, Carrier. Jan 24. Comp. Reg
 Feb 11.
 Davison, Chas, Playford, Kingston-upon-Hull, Blacksmith. Feb 9.
 Comp. Reg Feb 11.
 Disbrey, Chas, Melbourn, Cambridge, Cattle Dealer. Dec 18. Comp.
 Reg Feb 11.
 Durrant, John, High-st, Notting-hill, Jeweller. Jan 11. Comp. Reg
 Feb 8.
 Evans, Danl, Monmouth, Grocer. Jan 12. Comp. Reg Feb 9.
 Fauntleroy, Robt Thos, Bunhill-row, Hard Wood Merchant. Jan 23.
 Comp. Reg Feb 9.
 Finey, Edmd John Atkinson, Philpot-lane, Iron Merchant. Dec 10.
 Asst. Reg Feb 11.
 Garrard, Geo, Chelmondiston, Suffolk, Shipwright. Jan 31. Comp.
 Reg Feb 11.
 Gibson, Philip Robt, Cornhill, Gent. Feb 6. Comp. Reg Feb 9.
 Gillett, Geo, Preston, Lancaster, Cabinet Maker. Jan 24. Comp.
 Reg Feb 12.
 Goodfellow, Alfred, Wincanton, Somerset, Painter. Jan 16. Asst.
 Reg Feb 11.
 Goldstein, Alex, Lamb-st, Spitalfields, Hat Manufacturer. Feb 5.
 Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Green, Danl, jun, Gt College-st, Westminster, Brick Agent. Jan 23.
 Comp. Reg Feb 8.
 Groves, Joseph, Birm, Manufacturer of Iron Safes. Jan 23. Comp.
 Reg Feb 11.
 Hall, Richd, Falwell, Oxford, Farmer. Jan 19. Asst. Reg Feb 12.
 Hall, Leonard, March, Cambridge, Baker. Jan 19. Asst. Reg
 Feb 9.
 Hart, Joseph, & Richd Moulding Lunn, Leicester, Hosiery Manufac-
 turers. Feb 9. Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Heap, Thos, Manch, Silk Broker. Jan 31. Asst. Reg Feb 11.
 Hemmings, Jas, Dudley, Worcester, Boot Dealer. Jan 23. Comp. Reg
 Feb 11.
 Hickling, Chas John, & Joseph Wm Cox, Birm, Sewer Manufacturers.
 Jan 16. Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Hunt, John, Leamington Priors, Warwick, Builder. Jan 15. Asst.
 Reg Feb 11.
 Hutchinson, Fredk, Gresham-house, Merchant. Jan 11. Asst. Reg
 Feb 8.
 Isaacs, Lewis, Bell-st, Spitalfields, out of business. Feb 9. Comp.
 Reg Feb 11.
 Jilkins, Wm, Stradbroke, Suffolk, Auctioneer. Jan 15. Asst. Reg
 Feb 11.
 Linstead, Richd Thos, Rutland-yd, Knightsbridge, Plumber. Jan 31.
 Comp. Reg Feb 11.
 Longstaffs, Roger, Green's-end, Woolwich, Tobaccoist. Jan 16.
 Comp. Reg Feb 9.
 Mackenzie, Thos Hy, Copley-villas, Lyndhurst-rd, Peckham, Comm
 Agent. Feb 6. Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Miller, Hy, Tavistock-row, Covent-garden, Potato Salesman. Jan 29.
 Comp. Reg Feb 9.
 Molyneux, Chas, Sutherland-pl, Westbourne-park, Bayswater, Clerk.
 Feb 4. Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Murphy, John, Lpool, Wine Merchant. Jan 17. Comp. Reg Feb 9.
 Newton, Peter, Knutsford, Chester, Draper. Jan 14. Asst. Reg
 Feb 11.
 Paine, Jas Thos, Gordon-hotel, Covent-garden, Hotel Keeper. Feb 7.
 Comp. Reg Feb 11.

Rich, Geo, Nailsworth, Gloucester, Mealman. Jan 18. Comp. Reg
 Feb 11.
 Rowse, Wm Dent, Lpool, Clothier. Jan 25. Comp. Reg Feb 9.
 Schmidt, Leopold Wm Blake, King-st, St James's, Tailor. Jan 24.
 Comp. Reg Feb 8.
 Scurrah, Joseph, Leeds, Estate Agent. Jan 31. Comp. Reg Feb 8.
 Service, David, Lpool, Joiner. Jan 29. Comp. Reg Feb 8.
 Shannon, Davin Hy, Curry Rivel, Somerset, Draper. Feb 1. Comp
 Reg Feb 12.
 Sims, Joseph Farmer, & Alfred Hy Sims, Aston, nr Birm, Ironworkers.
 Jan 15. Asst. Reg Feb 11.
 Smith, Richd Collins, & John Barry Simpson, George-yard, Ship
 Brokers. Feb 7. Inspectorship. Reg Feb 11.
 Smith, Thos, Canterbury, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Jan 25. Comp.
 Reg Feb 9.
 St. Aubyn, Rev Wm John, Stoke Damerel, Devon, Clerk. Jan 28.
 Comp. Reg Feb 9.
 Taylor, Arthur, Springfield-rd, St John's Wood, Comm Agent. Feb 5.
 Comp. Reg Feb 11.
 Tomlinson, Edwd, Manch, Machinist. Jan 15. Asst. Reg Feb 12.
 Tresidder, Wm Rowe, Penryn, Cornwall, Butcher. Feb 4. Asst. Reg
 Feb 11.
 Tuke, Wm Epworth, Fen-et, Fenchurch-st, Wine Merchant. Jan 25.
 Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Turnbull, John Lumsdon, Marske, York, Merchant. Jan 21. Comp.
 Reg Feb 12.
 Wackett, Wm, Grinell-grove, nr Ilford, Essex, General Dealer. Feb 1.
 Comp. Reg Feb 12.
 Warburton, Robt, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Clothier. Jan 21. Conv.
 Reg Feb 9.
 Waring, John Hugh, Camden-grove, Peckham, Gent. Jan 12. Comp.
 Reg Feb 9.
 While, Wm, Newport, Monmouth, Slitter. Jan 19. Comp. Reg
 Feb 12.
 White, Joseph, Trinity-st, Newington, Oil Can Manufacturer. Feb 6.
 Comp. Reg Feb 11.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Feb. 8, 1867.

To Surrender in London.

Baker, Thos, Old Kent-rd, Butcher. Feb 5. Feb 25 at 11. Edwards,
 Farnval's-lane.
 Ballard, Geo, Fordingbridge, Southampton, Cabinet Maker. Feb 5.
 Feb 25 at 11. Paterson & Son, Bouverie-st, Fleet-st.
 Balding, Thos, Dersingham, Norfolk, Cattle Dealer. Feb 6. Feb
 20 at 1. Chilton & Co, Chancery-lane.
 Beard, Wm Day, Norwich, Clerk. Feb 19 at 12. Sole &
 Co, Aldermanbury.
 Boyes, Edwd, Cheriton, Hants, Blacksmith. Feb 4. Feb 21 at 11.
 Paterson & Son, Bouverie-st, Fleet-st.
 Cook, Thos Aynsley, Leicester, Vocalist. Feb 4. Feb 21 at 12.
 Allen, Chancery-lane.
 Coles, Wm, Brook-st, Hampstead-rd, Confectioner. Feb 3. Feb
 21 at 1. Johnson, Clifford's-lane.
 Darby, Walter, Hackney-rd, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb 5. Feb 20 at
 12. Fenton, Cambridge-heath, Bethnal-green.
 Doughty, Miles Hubbard, Blackfriars-rd, Chemist. Feb 5. Feb 21
 at 1. Dobie, Basinghall-st.
 Dumphreys, John, Fort-rd, Bermondsey, Leather Dresser. Feb 6.
 Feb 21 at 1. Goldrick, Strand.
 Durant, Anguish Honor Augustus, Ladbroke-ter, Notting-hill, Re-
 tired Military Officer. Feb 4. Feb 20 at 11. Staapools, Pinner's-
 hall, Old Broad-st.
 Everett, Jas, Stratford, out of business. Feb 6. Feb 30 at 1.
 Hanslip, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.
 Fisher, Geo Fredk, Portland-pl, Wandsworth-rd, Retailer of Beer.
 Feb 1. Feb 19 at 1. Binas, Trinity-sq, Southwark.
 Gamblin, Chas Hy, Winchester, Teacher of Music. Feb 4. Feb 21
 at 12. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury.
 Gee, Robt, Canterbury, Kent, Scrivener. Feb 31. Feb 21 at 2.
 Marsden, Friday-st, Chapside.
 Goodey, John, Three Colt-st, Bow, Cheesemonger's Assistant. Feb
 4. Feb 27 at 2. Croft, Montpelier-row, South Lambeth.
 Guy, Mary Ann, Myddleton-sq, Clerkenwell, Widow. Feb 2. Feb
 19 at 2. Lewis & Lewis, Ely-pl, Holborn.
 Harecourt, Chas, Gt George-st, Attorney-at-Law. Feb 6. Feb 21
 at 1. Hanslip, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.
 Harding, Wm, Cross-st, Islington, Baker. Feb 24. Feb 25 at 12.
 Ashurst & Co, Old Jewry.
 Hawkins, Thos John Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 6 (for
 pau). Feb 25 at 12. Gostley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.
 Henshaw, Wm Peachey, sen, Trinity-rd, Rotherhithe, Lighterman.
 Feb 4. Feb 21 at 12. Foggo, Borough-rd, Southwark.
 Herderschee, Jacobus Gerhardus, Crispin-st, Spitalfields, Provision
 Merchant. Feb 6. Feb 20 at 1. Lewis, Gt Marlborough-st.
 Hewitt, Geo, Brentford, Essex, Blacksmith. Feb 4. Feb 21 at 11.
 Preston & Dorman, Basinghall-st.
 Lemon, Geo, Fenchurch-st, out of business. Feb 2. Feb 21 at 11.
 Pittman, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-st.
 Linstead, Fredk, Newington Butts, Fishmonger. Feb 4. Feb 27
 at 2. Apps, South-sq, Gray's-lane.
 Lumsden, Jas, Pitt-st, St Pancras, out of business. Feb 6. Feb
 25 at 12. Regbin, Essex-st, Strand.
 Medcalf, Fredk Eardley, Aldersgate-st, Ferrier. Feb 18. Feb 20
 at 2. De Jersey & Co, Gresham-st West.
 Panting, Ann, Oxford, out of business. Feb 6. Feb 25 at 1. Pitt-
 man, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-st.
 Phillips, Lucy Eliza, Bolvedere, Kent, Governess. Feb 4. Feb 20
 at 11. Fowke, James-st, Adelphi.
 Richardson, Geo, Lisson-grove, Licensed Victualler. Feb 2. Feb
 27 at 1. Wyatt, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.
 Rooke, Chas, Blandford Forum, Dorset, Carpenter. Feb 3. Feb
 21 at 12. Fox, Chancery-lane.
 Sheppard, Louisa, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 2 (for pau).
 Feb 27 at 1. Brown, Basinghall-st.
 Spencer, Joseph Huntly, Hastings, out of business. Feb 5. Feb
 25 at 12. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.

Todd, John, Howard-rd, South Hornsey, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 5. Feb 20 at 12. Nash & Co, Suffolk-lane, Cannon-st.
Walker, Jas Robinson, Havelock-ter, Forest-hill, Tailor. Pet Feb 5. Feb 20 at 12. Peverley, Coleman-st.
Whitmarsh, Edwd Chas, Upper Stamford-st, Blackfriars-rd, Harness Ma or. Pet Feb 5. Feb 20 at 12. Daniels & Co, Fore-st.
Winscom, Alfred Lewis, Windmill-rd, Croydon West, Baker. Pet Feb 4. Feb 21 at 12. Pittman, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-st.
Wint, Harris, Middlesex-st, Aldgate, Clothier. Pet Feb 6. Feb 21 at 12. Murray, Gt St Helen's.

To Surrender in the Country.

Adams, Walter, Nottingham, out of business. Pet Feb 2. Nottingham, March 6 at 11. Heathcote, Nottingham.
Baker, John, Brades Village, Rowley Regis, Stafford, Charter Master. Pet Feb 4. Birm, Feb 23 at 12. Jackson, Westbromwich.
Ball, John, Hanley, Stafford, Butcher. Pet Feb 6. Hanley, Feb 23 at 11. Salt, Tunstall.
Barry, Gerald Joseph, Seaham Harbour, Durham, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet Feb 9. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 12 at 1. Robinson, Sunderland.
Bickerton, Thos, Hanley, Stafford, Grocer. Pet Feb 5. Hanley, Feb 23 at 11. Moxon, Hanley.
Buckthought, Wm, Fraddon, Cornwall, Mine Agent. Pet Jan 28. St Columb Major, Feb 13 at 10. Whitefield, St Columb Major.
Bunting, Wm, Deeking, Norfolk, Baker. Pet Feb 1. Little Walsingham, Feb 23 at 11. Garwood, jun, Wells.
Clegg, Robt, & Abraham Clegg, Brownde Shed, nr Burnley, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturers. Pet Jan 19. March, Feb 23 at 11. Marsland & Co, Manchester.
Davy, Richd, Pendleton, Lancaster, Journeyman Colour Maker. Pet Feb 4. Salford, Feb 23 at 9.30. Addleshaw, Manch.
Dawson, John Horn, Great Grimby, Lincoln, Grocer. Pet Feb 5. Leeds, Feb 20 at 12. England & Co, Hull.
Day, Wm, Luton, Bedford, Bleacher. Pet Feb 2. Luton, Feb 19 at 10. Scargill, Luton.
Denman, Jeffery, Bridgwater, Somerset, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 6. Exeter, Feb 18 at 1. Reed & Co, Bridgwater.
Duckworth, Peter, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Pet Jan 16. Birkenhead, Feb 19 at 12.
Dyer, John, St Austell, Cornwall, Grocer. Pet Feb 5. Exeter, Feb 18 at 1. Carlyon, St Austell.
Eaton, Wm Hopkins, Milton Abbas, Dorset, Tailor. Pet Feb 2. Blandford, Feb 23 at 3. Atkinson, Blandford.
Ellis, Hy, Ecclesfield, York, Draper. Adj Jan 21. Leeds, Feb 27 at 12.
Farmer, Geo, jun, Aston, near Birmingham, Machinist. Pet Feb 6. Birm, Feb 22 at 12. Allen, Birm.
Farnodon, John, Leicester, Loombuilder. Pet Feb 6. Birm, Feb 26 at 11. Macaulay, Leicester.
Fletcher, John, Spring-lane within Radcliffe, Lancaster, Loom Overlooker. Pet Feb 1. Bury, Feb 21 at 11. P. & J. Watson, Bury.
Gallaher, John Hutchinson, Lpool, Slater. Pet Feb 6. Lpool, Feb 22 at 11. Baxter, Lpool.
Gibbs, Thos, Fareham, Hants, Plasterer. Adj Jan 14. Portsmouth, Feb 21 at 11. White, Portsea.
Green, Richd, Willersey, Gloucester, Publican. Pet Feb 5. Bristol, Feb 20 at 11. Brittain & Son, Bristol.
Hamilton, Thos, Barrow-upon-Humber, Lincoln, Coal Dealer. Pet Feb 5. Barton-upon-Humber, Feb 27 at 11. Nowell & Priestley, Barton-upon-Humber.
Haynes, John, Oakfield, nr Ryde, Isle of Wight, General Dealer. Adj Jan 14. Newport, Feb 20 at 11.
Hollies, Wm, jun, Halesowen, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 5. Birm, Feb 20 at 12. Hayes & Wright, Halesowen.
Holsberg, Philipp August, & Thos Hy Bowen, Lpool, Merchants. Pet Jan 31. Lpool, Feb 25 at 11. Haigh & Denno, Lpool.
Howarth, Eli, Bolton, Lancashire, Joiner. Pet Feb 4. Bolton, Feb 20 at 10. Edge & Marks, Bolton.
Howard, Edwd, Swansea, Glamorgan, Auctioneer. Pet Feb 5. Swansea, Feb 19 at 2. Morris, Swansea.
Hunter, Wm, Aston, Warwick, Gunmaker. Pet Feb 4. Birm, March 8 at 10. Corles, Birm.
Jackson, Chas Jas Bloomfield, Pontypool, Monmouth, Auctioneer. Pet Feb 1. Pontypool, Feb 18 at 11. Bradgate, Newport.
Jenkins, David, Swansea, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 6. Swansea, Feb 19 at 2. Morris, Swansea.
Joel, Edwd Gadalia, Sunderland, Durham, Dentist. Pet Feb 4. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 19 at 12. Bush, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Jones, John, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 4. Bristol, Feb 18 at 11. Waldron, Cardiff.
Jones, Thos, Swansea, Glamorgan, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet Feb 5. Swansea, Feb 19 at 2. Morris, Swansea.
Jull, John, Canterbury, Kent. Pet Feb 4. Canterbury, Feb 15 at 12. De Laux, Canterbury.
Kingson, Hy, Brighton, Retailer of Beer. Pet Feb 4. Brighton, Feb 23 at 11. Lamb, Brighton.
Langdale, Jas Joseph, Swindon, Wilts, Cabinet Maker. Pet Feb 2. Swindon, Feb 19 at 11. Bradford & Foot, Swindon.
Laws, Wm, Ely, Cambridge, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 4. Ely, Feb 21 at 11. French, Cambridge.
Leech, Peter, Congleton, Chester, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 2. Congleton, Feb 16 at 2. Washington, Congleton.
Lockett, Joseph, Denton, Lancaster, Retailer of Beer. Pet Feb 2. Hyde, Feb 20 at 9.30. Reddish, Manch.
Lyntage, Oliver, Manch, out of employment. Pet Feb 6. Salford, Feb 23 at 9.30. Jones, Manch.
Marsh, Wm, Portsea, Hants, Grocer. Pet Feb 5. Portsmouth, Feb 21 at 11. White, Portsea.
Maskery, Geo, Hauley, Stafford, Colour Maker. Pet Feb 1. Hanley, Feb 23 at 11. Tennant, Hanley.
McWhan, Geo, & David McWhan, Middlesbrough-on-Tees, York, Grocers. Pet Feb 6. Stockton-on-Tees, Feb 20 at 11. Stevenson, Darlington.
Melbourne, Robt Rivers, Kingston-upon-Hull, Theatrical Manager. Pet Feb 6. Leeds, Feb 20 at 12. Bell, Hull.
Muir, John Saunders, Tranmere, Chester, Accountant. Pet Jan 31. Birkenhead, Feb 18 at 10. Moore, Birkenhead.

Newth, Louisa, St Catherine, Gloucester, Butcher. Pet Feb 4. Gloucester, Feb 23 at 12. Smallridge, Gloucester.
Poole, Jas, Ipswich, Suffolk, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet Feb 6. Ipswich, Feb 20 at 11. Pollard, Ipswich.
Pollitt, John, Heywood, Lancaster, Cotton Spinner. Pet Dec 6. Manch, Feb 20 at 12. Sale & Co, Manch.
Renshaw, Wm, Mansfield, Nottingham, Butcher. Pet Feb 6. Mansfield, March 19 at 11. Briggs, Nottingham.
Roe, Saml, Leicester, Carpenter. Pet Feb 1. Leicester, Feb 23 at 10. Petty, Leicester.
Rogan, Patrick, Lpool, Vocalist. Pet Feb 4. Lpool, Feb 19 at 3. Ritson, Lpool.
Smith, Saml, Leicester, Cabinet Maker. Pet Feb 6. Leicester, Feb 23 at 10. Arnall, Leicester.
Smith, Jas, Salisbury, Wilts, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 6. Salisbury, Feb 25 at 3. Godwin, Winchester.
Smart, Fred, Lower Broughton, nr Manch, Accountant. Pet Feb 4. Salford, Feb 23 at 9.30. Addleshaw, Manch.
Stephenson, Amos, South Shields, Durham, Draper. Pet Feb 4. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 19 at 12. Graham, Sunderland.
Sollings, Chas Turner, Ipswich, Suffolk, Brush Maker. Pet Feb 5. Ipswich, Feb 20 at 11. Pollard, Ipswich.
Tildesley, Geo Fredk, Willenhall, Stafford, Iron Merchant. Pet Feb 5. Birm, Feb 23 at 12. Allen, Birm.
Trow, Thos, Christchurch, Monmouth, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 28. Newport, Feb 20 at 10. Cathcart, Newport.
Tucker, Thos, Glamorgan, Steam Tug Proprietor. Pet Feb 6. Bristol, Feb 20 at 11. Raby, Cardiff.
Underhill, Geo, Birm, out of business. Pet Feb 4. Birm, March 8 at 10. Laws, Dudley.
Waldeck, David, Baldock, Hertford, Comm Agent. Pet Feb 3. Hitchin, Feb 21 at 12. Barker, Baldock.
Warburton, Geo Oneby, Leicester, Comm Agent. Pet Feb 4. Birm, Jan 20 at 12. Walford, Birm.
Washington, John, Salford, Lancaster, Grocer. Pet Feb 5. Salford, Feb 23 at 9.30. Gardner, Manch.
Watson, Wm, Huddersfield, York, out of business. Pet Feb 4. Leeds, Feb 21 at 11. Mosley, Huddersfield.
White, Saml, Old-hill, Stafford, out of business. Pet Feb 5. Dudley, Feb 21 at 12. Stokes, Dudley.

TUESDAY, Feb. 12, 1867.

To Surrender in London.

Banks, Geo Linnaus, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 8 (for pau). Feb 25 at 2. Goatley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.
Binco, Moses, jun, Farnham Royal, Bucks, out of business. Pet Feb 7. Feb 28 at 11. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury.
Gillett, Jas, Bampton, Oxford, Farmer. Pet Feb 8. Feb 27 at 11. Murrrough, Warwick-ct, Gray's-inn.
Gracey, Nathaniel, Gravesend, Kent, Earthenware Dealer. Pet Jan 30. Feb 25 at 12. Shearman, Little Tower-st.
Heffernon, Geo, & Eli Heffernon, Lucan-pl, Hoxton, Middx, Tripe Dressers. Pet Feb 9. Feb 25 at 1. Wyatt, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.
Hilme, Chas, Gresham-st, Warehouseman. Pet Feb 8. Feb 25 at 11. Peck & Downing, Basinghall-st.
Howcroft, John Allen, Drury-lane, out of business. Pet Feb 9. Feb 25 at 12. Begbie, Essex-st, Strand.
Inkpen, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 4 (for pau). Feb 27 at 2. Dobie, Basinghall-st.
Kent, Alfred Hy, Jubilee-st, Mile-end, Tailor. Pet Feb 8. Feb 28 at 11. Lumley & Lumley, Moorgate-st.
Lawrence, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 8 (for pau). Feb 25 at 12. Dobie, Basinghall-st.
Longland, John, Hastings, Northampton, Victualler. Pet Feb 8. March 6 at 11. Clarke & Co, Coleman-st.
Nelson, Chas Coventry, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 7. Feb 25 at 2. Emslie & Co, Leadenhall-st.
Nightingale, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 9 (for pau). March 6 at 12. Rigby, Coleman-st.
Norton, Geo, Codford St Mary, Wilts, Plumber. Pet Feb 8. Feb 25 at 12. Jones, New-inn, Strand.
Nutycombe, Fredk, St Peter's-ter, Notting-hill, Bootmaker. Pet Feb 5. Feb 23 at 11. Hanslip, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.
Phillips, Joseph, Mitre-st, Aldgate, Fruit Merchant. Pet Feb 7. Feb 25 at 11. Howell, Cheapside.
Pryor, Jas Logan, Alexandra-ter, George's-rd, Peckham, Comm Agent. Pet Feb 7. Feb 25 at 2. Steadman, Mason's-avenue, Coleman-st.
Wetherall, Richd, Forest-hill, Kent, Labourer. Pet Feb 8. Feb 28 at 11. Daniels & Co, Fore-st.
Wigley, Hy, Shrubland-rd, Dalston, Clerk. Pet Feb 8. Feb 25 at 2. Hall, Coleman-st.

To Surrender in the Country.

Aish, Geo, North Petherton, Somerset, Carpenter. Pet Feb 9. Bridgwater, Feb 26 at 10. Cook, jun, Bridgwater.
Bacon, Wm, Manch. Pet Feb 7. Manch, Feb 26 at 9.30. Eltoft, Manch.
Bartholomew, Fredk, Sheffield, Bootmaker. Pet Feb 7. Sheffield, Feb 21 at 1. Binney & Son, Sheffield.
Bebington, Wm, Manch, Baker. Pet Feb 6. Manch, Feb 26 at 9.30. Law, Manch.
Birch, Wm, Lpool, Cartowner. Pet Feb 7. Lpool, Feb 25 at 11. Etky, Lpool.
Blakemore, Thos, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Tailor. Pet Jan 16. Wolverhampton, March 11 at 12. Bartlett, Wolverhampton.
Clark, Hy, Truro, Cornwall, Butcher. Pet Feb 7. Truro, Feb 23 at 3. Marshall, Truro.
Clews, Joseph, Sevenoaks, Kent, Brick Machine Maker. Pet Feb 6 (for pau). Sevenoaks, Feb 23 at 11.
Colledge, Thos, Warwick, out of business. Pet Feb 6. Warwick, Feb 23 at 11. Oversell, Leamington Priors.
Cope, John, sen, & John Cope, jun, Leicester, Carriers. Pet Feb 9. Birm, Feb 26 at 11. Owstop, Leicester.
Craven, Geo, Dacre Banks, York, Mason. Pet Feb 9. Ripon, Feb 25 at 1. Harle, Leeds.
Denton, Joseph, Buglett, Flint, Butcher. Pet Feb 6. Holywell, Feb 21 at 11. Davies, Holywell.

Drake, Eliza, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Jan 16. Manch, Feb 26 at 3. Harris, Lpool.

Elliot, Jas. Norwich, Stage Actor. Pet Feb 4. Norwich, Feb 20 at 11. Page, Norwich.

Garth, Peter, Idle, York, Plumber. Pet Feb 8. Bradford, Feb 26 at 9.45. Watson & Dickens, Bradford.

Gilbert, Wm, Pilton, Devon, Painter. Pet Feb 6. Barnstaple, Feb 26 at 12. Bencraft, Barnstaple.

Goodwin, Wm, Maidstone, Kent, Poulterer. Pet Feb 4. Maidstone.

Green, Thos, Norwich, Bricklayer. Pet Feb 5. Norwich, Feb 20 at 11. Culley, Norwich.

Gregg, John, Ledbury, Hereford, Coal Merchant. Pet Feb 8. Ledbury, March 5 at 11. Reece, Ledbury.

Gregson, Thos, Barnard Castle, Durham, Grocer. Pet Feb 8. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 27 at 12. J. & R. S. Watson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Hetherington, Wm, Penrith, Cumberland, Grocer. Pet Jan 19. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 22 at 12. Hodge & Harle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Hughes, Jas, Llanfairfechan, Carnarvon, Plumber. Pet Feb 5. Bangor, March 8 at 10. Jones, Conway.

Hunter, Michael, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, French Polisher. Pet Feb 8. Sunderland, March 1 at 12. Graham, Sunderland.

Jones, Chas, Madeley, Hereford, out of business. Pet Feb 8. Birm, Feb 25 at 12. Parry, Birm.

Kirby, John, Flaxton, York, Horse Breaker. Pet Feb 8. Leeds, Feb 25 at 11. Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

Klaser, Constantine, Hereford, Clock Maker. Pet Feb 9. Hereford, Feb 27 at 10. Garrold & Meadows, Hereford.

Laur, Jas, Pendleton, Lancaster, Coachman. Pet Feb 8. Salford, Feb 23 at 9.30. Abbott, Manch.

Mathewman, Benj, jun, Sheffield, Comm Agent. Pet Feb 7. Sheffield, Feb 21 at 1. Binney & Son, Sheffield.

Millward, Jas, Halesowen, Worcester, Grocer. Pet Feb 7. Stourbridge, Feb 25 at 10. Horner, Brierley-hill.

Nixon, Thos, Povey, Cumberland, Farmer. Pet Feb 8. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 27 at 12. Ramshaw & Reed, Brampton.

Parkinson, Wm, Burnley, Lancaster, Assistant Overseer. Pet Feb 7. Manch, Feb 23 at 11. Gardner, Manch.

Pear, John, Wolsingham, Durham, Tailor. Pet Feb 8. Wolsingham, Feb 26 at 10. Dolphin, Wolsingham.

Pearce, Wm, Sheerness, Kent, Messman. Pet Feb 9. Sheerness, Feb 27 at 12.30. Sharland, Gravesend.

Phillips, Joseph, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Journeyman Gasfitter. Pet Feb 4. Wolverhampton, March 11 at 12. Underhill, Wolverhampton.

Rice, Wm, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 8. Bristol, Feb 22 at 11. Brittan & Son, Bristol.

Ryder, Wm, Epworth, Lincoln, out of business. Pet Feb 9. Leeds, March 6 at 12. Summers, Hull.

Shircliffe, Hannah, Worksop, Nottingham, Bootmaker. Pet Feb 11. Leeds, Feb 27 at 12. Smith & Burdakin, Sheffield.

Smith, Jas Cotton, Lincoln, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet Feb 8. Lincoln, Feb 25 at 11. Brown & Son, Lincoln.

Smith, Wm, Warwick, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 4. Warwick, Feb 23 at 11. Overell, Leamington Priors.

Sparrow, John, Stivechal, Warwick, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 5. Coventry, March 5 at 3. Smallbone, Coventry.

Tonge, John Brodyden, Castletown, Stafford, Joiner. Pet Jan 30. Birm, Feb 27 at 12. Hodgson & Son, Birm.

Truoghan, Thos, Redruth, Cornwall, Carpenter. Pet Feb 7. Redruth, Feb 26 at 11. Trevena, Redruth.

Wedge, Erwin Harvey, Manch, Mining Agent. Pet Jan 17. Manch, Feb 22 at 11. Marsland & Adleshaw, Manch.

Walstell, Thos, Bootle-cum-Linacre, Lancaster, Bootmaker. Pet Feb 7. Lpool, Feb 27 at 3. Henry, Lpool.

Wannop, Nathan, Hill-field, Walton, Cumberland, Farmer. Pet Feb 8. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Feb 27 at 12. Ramshaw & Reed, Brampton.

Watts, Robt, Prisoner for Debt, Oxford. Adj Jan 22. Chipping Norton, Feb 24 at 11.

Watts, Jas, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Painter. Pet Feb 7. Cardiff, Feb 25 at 11. Griffith, Cardiff.

Weldon, Christopher, Darlington, Durham, Medical Herbalist. Pet Feb 7. Darlington, Feb 25 at 10. Steavenson, Darlington.

Warton, Geo, Manch, Furniture Broker. Pet Feb 7. Manch, Feb 26 at 11. Jackson, Manch.

Whitham, Wm, Sheffield, Cigar Dealer. Pet Feb 7. Sheffield, Feb 21 at 1. Turner, Sheffield.

Wilshire, Hy, Brandon, Suffolk, Butcher. Pet Feb 5. Thetford, Feb 25 at 12. Salmon, Bury St Edmunds.

Winter, Wm, Barnstaple, Devon, Brushmaker. Pet Feb 9. Barnstaple, March 12 at 12. Finch, Barnstaple.

Woodward, John, Prisoner for Debt, Oxford. Adj Jan 22. Oxford, Feb 22 at 12.30.

Woodford, Hy, Welford, Northampton, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 7. Lut-terworth, Feb 27 at 12. Ouston, Leicester.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Feb. 8, 1867.

Mayor, Joseph, Worksop, Nottingham, out of business. Feb 4.

TUESDAY, Feb. 12, 1867.

Phillips, John, Duke-st, Stamford-st, Rag Merchant. Feb 12.

18s. per doz. **TARRAGONES.** per doz. 18s

BOTTLES AND CASES INCLUDED.

Post Orders on Vere Street.

CHARLES WARD AND SON,
WINE MERCHANTS,
MAYFAIR, W., LONDON.

18s. per doz. **TARRAGONES.** per doz. 18s.

GRESHAM LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,
37, OLD JEWRY, LONDON. E.C.
SOLICITORS are invited to introduce, on behalf of their clients, Proposals for Loans on Freehold or Leasehold Property, Reversions, Life Interests, or other adequate securities.
Proposals may be made in the first instance according to the following form:—

PROPOSAL FOR LOAN ON MORTGAGES.

Date.....

Introduced by (state name and address of solicitor)

Amount required £

Time and mode of repayment (i.e., whether for a term certain, or by annual or other payments)

Security (state shortly the particulars of security, and, if land or buildings, state the net annual income)

State what Life Policy (if any) is proposed to be effected with the Gresham Office in connexion with the security.

By order of the Board,

F. ALLAN CURTIS, Actuary and Secretary.

YATES AND ALEXANDER,
PRINTERS,

7, 8, 9, Church Passage, Chancery Lane, E.C.,

Parliamentary Bills, Appeals, Bills of Complaint, Memorandums and Articles of Association, Legal Forms, Notices, &c.

Prospectuses of Public Companies, Share Certificates, Show Cards, Cheques, Insurance Tables, Policies, Proposals, Forms.

Catalogues, Particulars and Conditions of Sale, Posting Bills, and all General Printing.

BILLS OF COMPLAINT AND ANSWERS

FOR CASH, 4s. 6d. PER PAGE,

A Lower Charge than has hitherto been offered by the Trade.

PRICE IF PUT TO ACCOUNT,

	10 Copies.	20 Copies.	30 Copies.	50 Copies.
8 pages.....	£2 2s. 0s.	£2 3s. 6d.	£2 4s. 6d.	£2 6s. 6d.

YATES & ALEXANDER,

LAW, PARLIAMENTARY, AND GENERAL PRINTERS,

7, 8, 9, Church Passage, Chancery Lane, E.C.

SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coating of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals possessing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equal to Sterling Silver.

	Fiddle Pattern.	Thread.	King's.
Table Forks, per doz.....	£ 1 0 0 and 1 18 0	£ 2 3 0	£ 3 0 0
Dessert ditto	1 0 0 and 1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0
Table Spoons	1 10 0 and 1 18 0	2 8 0	3 0 0
Dessert ditto	1 0 0 and 1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0
Tea Spoons	0 12 0 and 0 18 0	1 3 6	1 10 0

Every Article for the Table as in Silver. A Sample Tea Spoon forwarded on receipt of 20 stamps.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON.

SLACK'S FENDER AND FIRE-IRON WARE-HOUSE is the most ECONOMICAL, consistent with good quality:—Iron Fenders, 3s. 6d.; Bronzed ditto, 8s. 6d., with standards; superior Drawing-room ditto, 14s. 6d. to 50s.; Fire Irons, 2s. 6d. to 20s. Patent Dish Covers, with handles to take off, 18s. set of six. Table Knives and Forks, 8s. per dozen. Roasting Jacks, complete, 7s. 6d. Tea-trays, 6s. 6d. set of three; elegant Papier Maché ditto, 15s. the set. Teapots, with plated knob, 8s. 6d.; Coal Scuttles, 2s. 6d. A set of Kitchen Utensils for cottage, £3. Slack's Cutlery has been celebrated for 50 years. Ivory Table Knives, 14s., 16s., and 18s. per dozen. White Bone Knives and Forks, 8s. 9d. and 12s.; Black Horn ditto, 8s. and 10s. All warranted.

As the limits of an advertisement will not allow of a detailed list, purchasers are requested to send for their Catalogue, with 350 drawings, and prices of Electro-Plate, Warranted Table Cutlery, Furnishing Ironmongery, &c. May be had gratis or post free. Every article marked in plain figures at the same low prices for which their establishment has been celebrated for nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 delivered carriage free per rail.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON,
Opposite Somerset House.

TO SOLICITORS, &c., requiring DEED BOXES,
will find the best-made article lower than any other house. Lists of Prices and sizes may be had gratis or sent post free.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, Strand, opposite Somerset House. Established nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 sent carriage free.

TO SOLICITORS.—OFFICE FOR PATENTS,
1, SERLE-STREET, LINCOLN'S-INN, W.C.
Messrs. DAVIES & HUNT procure British and Foreign Patents, &c., at most moderate charges, and to solicitors at agency rates.
Solicitors and intending Patentees should obtain their "Handbook for Inventors," gratis on application or by letter.

A SOVEREIGN REMEDY for BAD TEA.—A
leaded package, containing five pounds of the most delicious BLACK TEA the world produces (and which will please everybody), sent carriage free to any railway station or market town in England, on receipt of post-office order or cheque for 20s., by R. H. PHILLIPS & Co., Tea Merchants, 8, King William-street, City, London, E.C.

PHILLIPS & Co. have no agents, and no connection with any house in Worcester or Swansea.

A General Price List sent Post Free.

BOROUGH OF LEEDS.—Gentlemen wishing to apply for the OFFICE of TOWN CLERK of Leeds are requested to send their Applications and Testimonials to the Town Clerk's Office on or before the 7th day of February next. The gentleman appointed will be required to devote the whole of his time to the duties of his office. The salary will be £1,000 net per annum, the Council paying his clerks and all other expenses of his office. Further particulars to be had from the Deputy Town Clerk.

By order of the Council,
JAMES WARDELL, Deputy Town Clerk.
Leeds, 25th January, 1867.

BOROUGH OF LEEDS.—Notice is hereby given that the time for sending in applications for the office of Town Clerk of this Borough is extended from the 7th instant to the 1st day of March next.

By order,
JAMES WARDELL, Deputy Town Clerk.
Leeds, 7th February, 1867.

Just out, price 2s.,
OVEREND, GURNEY, & CO. — Liabilities
£24,000,000. Report of the Committee of the Defence Association; also Report of Mr. Oswald Howell; and the Accounts and Names of Debtors, alphabetically arranged, to the amount of £5,093,801. Loans on fictitious securities. Full explanation of the frauds, &c.
Printed and Published for the Committee by Standidge & Co., 35, Old Jewry; and may be had of all booksellers.

Now ready, in 1 vol., pp. 208, price 7s., 6d.
A TREATISE ON THE LOCUS STANDI OF PETITIONERS against PRIVATE BILLS in PARLIAMENT. Second Edition, containing Reports of cases decided in the last session, by James Mellor Smethurst, Esq., of Trinity College, Cambridge, M.A., and of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. "The general design of the work is clear and simple, and its arrangement makes it easy of reference." *The Law Journal*, "A careful, attentive, and skilful digest of the decisions."—*Solicitors' Journal*.

STEVENS & HAYNES, 11, Bell-yard, Temple Bar.

Now complete, in 2 vols. 8vo, price £4 4s., cloth.
DANIELL'S CHANCERY PRACTICE.
THE PRACTICE OF THE HIGH COURT OF CHANCERY: with some Observations on the Pleadings in that Court. By the late EDMUND ROBERT DANIELL, Barrister-at-Law. Fourth Edition, with considerable Additions, incorporating the Statutes, Orders, and Cases to the present time; and Braithwaite's Record and Writ Practice. Together with References to a companion volume of Forms and Precedents. By LEONARD FIELD and EDWARD CLENNELL DUNN, Barristers-at-Law, assisted by JOHN BIDDLE, of the Master of the Rolls' Chambers.

STEVENS & SONS, No. 26, Bell-yard, Lincoln's-inn.

USEFUL LIBRARY.—New Volume, in fop. 8vo., cloth boards, 1s., or by post, 1s. 2d.,

A HANDY-BOOK OF THE LAW OF LONDON CABS AND OMNIBUSES. By WILLIAM THOMAS CHARLEY, B.A., of the Inner Temple, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. The object of the author has been to supply those who ride in cabs or omnibuses, and also the proprietors, the drivers, and the conductors of these public vehicles, with a condensed summary of the laws and regulations on which their mutual rights and liabilities depend.

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, the Broadway, Ludgate-hill.

In one volume, crown 8vo., price 3s.
A TREATISE ON THE ENGLISH LAW OF DOMICIL. Dedicated, by permission, to Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Torin Kinslerby. By OLIVER STEPHEN ROUND, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law.
London: 59, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn.

Just published, Second Edition, price 3s.
THE LAW OF TRADE MARKS, with some account of its History and Development in the Decisions of the Courts of Law and Equity. By EDWARD LLOYD, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law, London.

"I am indebted to the very valuable little publication of Mr. Lloyd who has collected all the authorities on this subject."—V. C. WOOD, in *McAndrew v. Bassett*, March 4.

London: 59, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

THE COMPANIES ACT, 1862.
EVERY requisite under the above Act supplied on the shortest notice. The BOOKS AND FORMS kept in stock for immediate use. ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No charge for sketches.
Companies Fee Stamps.

ASH & FLINT,
Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet-street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn).

BY ROYAL COMMAND.
METALLIC PEN MAKER TO THE QUEEN.
JOSEPH GILLOTT respectfully directs the attention of the Commercial Public, and of all who use Steel Pens, to the incomparable excellences of his productions, which for Quality of Material, Easy Action, and Great Durability, will ensure universal preference.

They can be obtained, retail, of every dealer in the world; wholesale at the Works, Graham-street, Birmingham; 91, John-street, New York, and at 37, Gracechurch-street, London.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S
FEBRUARY LIST OF ESTATES AND HOUSES, including landed estates, town and country residences, hunting and shooting quarters, farms, ground-rents, rent-charges, house property, and investments generally, may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Chapside, E.C., or by post for one stamp. Particulars for insertion in the March List must be received by the 28th February at latest.

To Landowners, Trustees, Farmers, Solicitors, and Others.

MESSRS. YEULETT & SON, Auctioneers,
Valuers, and Land Surveyors, beg to inform the above they continue to make Surveys of Land and Valuations of Estates, Farms, &c., with promptitude, guaranteed accuracy, and despatch. Property submitted to Auction on moderate terms, which may be known on application at their Offices, 13, Walbrook, London, E.C.

MR. ROBINS, of 5, Waterloo-place, Pall Mall,
Auctioneer, Surveyor, &c., respectfully gives notice that his LIST OF PROPERTY for SALE, including every class of investment, some specially eligible, will be forwarded post-free on application as above. Money required on Mortgage, in sums of various amount, on good securities.

BROOKS & SCHALLER (removed from Piccadilly)
—The INDEX, printed MONTHLY (first published in 1820), of ESTATES, Country and Town Houses, Manors, Hunting Quarters, Shootings and Fishings, Farms, &c., to be LET or SOLD, can be had (free) at their Offices, 25, Charles-street, St. James's, S.W., opposite the Junior United Service Club. Particulars inserted without charge, but for next publication must be forwarded before the 28th of each month.

THE RENT GUARANTEE SOCIETY,
Established 1850. Capital £100,000.

Owners of Property travelling, or having special engagements to meet, can have a portion of their Rents remitted or paid to their credit on fixed days without extra charge.

Office, 3 Charlotte-row, Mansion House.

WHAT IS YOUR CREST AND MOTTO?—

Send name and county to Culleton's Heraldic Office, with 3s. 6d. for plain sketch; in heraldic colours, 6s. The arms of man and wife blended. The proper colours for servants' livery. Family pedigrees traced. Culleton's book of family crests and mottoes, 4,000 engravings, printed in colours, £10 10s. The Manual of Heraldry, 400 engravings, 3s. 6d.; crest engraved on seals, rings, and dies, 7s. 6d.; book plate engraved with arms, 21s.—T. CULLETON, Genealogist, 25, Cranbourne-street, corner of St. Martin's-lane.

CULLETON'S EMBOSSED PRESSES, 21s., for Stamping Paper with Crest, Monogram, or Address. Anyone can use them.—25, Cranbourne-street.

BOOK-PLATES Engraved with Arms and Crest, 21s.
Livery-button Dies, 2s. 6d. Crest on silver spoons or forks, 5s. per dozen; Crest on seals or steel dies, 7s. 6d. Desk Seals with engraved crest or monogram, 12s.—I. CULLETON, 25, Cranbourne-street.

5 QUIRE OF PAPER, 3s., Stamped with Monogram; 100 Envelopes, 1s. 6d. No charge for engraving Steel Die with Monogram, Crest, or Address, if an order be given for a Ream of very best paper and 500 Envelopes, all Stamped, for 21s., or P.O. order. Monograms designed, 1s.—25, Cranbourne-street.

CULLETON'S VISITING CARD.—A copper-plate engraved and 50 superfine Cards printed for 2s.; post-free, 2s. 3d.—25, Cranbourne-street.

CULLETON'S PLATES FOR MARKING LINEN.
The most permanent way of marking Linen with Crest, Monogram, or Name. Anyone can use them. Initial Plate, 1s.; Name Plate, 2s. 6d.; Set of Movable Numbers, 2s. 6d.; Crest, 3s.; with directions, post-free for cash or stamps. By T. CULLETON, Seal Engraver to her Majesty and Disinker to the Board of Trade, 25, Cranbourne-street (corner of St. Martin's-lane), W.C.

MESSRS. HOOPER & SON beg to announce that after this date great and most important Reductions will be made in their Charges for Copying and Engraving, effecting in some cases a saving of one-fourth, and in others as much as one-third.

The New Scale will be—Engravings, round-hand on Parchment, or Paper, Copies at full length, and attested Copies (except Parliamentary and expedition work) 1½d. per folio. As most of this has hitherto been charged 2d. per folio there will be a saving of one-fourth.

Abstracts, Bills of Costs, Briefs, and all other documents (except as above), 1d. per folio. The charge for this work has been 1½d. per folio, the saving will be one-third.

The terms on which custom is solicited are—Cash in advance for Stamps; and, as regards the writing, Cash if required on delivery, but, as a rule the general account will only be sent in once a month.
45, Fleet-street, 5th January, 1867

THE SMOKER'S BONBON effectually removes the Taste and Smell of Tobacco from the Mouth and Breath, and renders Smoking agreeable and safe. It is very pleasant and wholesome. Prepared by a patent process, from the recipe of an eminent physician, by SCHOOLING & Co., Wholesale Confectioners, Bethnal-green, London, in Sixpenny and Shilling boxes; post free, 7 and 14 stamps.—Sold by Chemists, Tobacconists, &c.